THE NEW ENGLAND QVARTERLY

Registered in the United States Patent Office

An Historical Review of New England Life and Letters

EDITORS

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON

ARTHUR M. SCHLESINGER — KENNETH B. MURDOCK

LEONARD W. LABAREE — CLARENCE H. FAUST

ALLYN B. FORBES — BERNARD DEVOTO

AUSTIN WARREN

Book Review Editor

PERRY MILLER

Managing Editor

MILTON ELLIS

Volume XV Number 2

June, 1942

Copyright 1942 by the New England Quarterly

CONTENTS

To Readers and Correspondents		223
The Frontier and Our Institutions	*G. W. Pierson*	224
Harvard's Commemoration Day, 1865	*H. V. Bail*	256
Memnonia: The Launching of a Utopia	*B.-M. Stearns*	280
Hawthorne and Dostoevski	*Vladimir Astrov*	296
The Antecedents of Brook Farm	*J. B. Wilson*	320
Memoranda and Documents		
Letters of the Maine Boundary Commissioners	*W. L. Lucey*	332
Thoreau and College Discipline	*F. T. McGill*	349
Book Reviews		
The Economic Novel in America, by W. F. Taylor	*George Mayberry*	354
Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790–1800, by E. P. Link	*G. A. Koch*	357
The Andover Liberals: A Study in American Theology, by D. D. Williams	*W. W. Sweet*	361
A Political History of Connecticut during the Civil War, by J. R. Lane	*A. B. Darling*	363
Timothy Dwight, 1752–1817: A Biography, by C. E. Cuningham	*S. E. Mead*	365
American Primitive Painting, by Jean Lipman	*W. L. Nathan*	368
The Maritime Provinces of British North America and the American Revolution, by W. B. Kerr	*H. A. Davis*	373
Recollections of an Old Fashioned New Englander, by F. W. Dallinger	*Robert Walcott*	374
George Keith (1638–1716), by E. W. Kirby	*F. B. Tolles*	376
Independent Vermont, by C. M. Thompson	*Crane Brinton*	378
Sherman Thacher and His School, by L. M. Makepeace	*W. J. Bender*	380
Lincoln and the Radicals, by T. Harry Williams	*Oscar Handlin*	381
The Politics of Mercantilism, by P. W. Buck	*R. S. Cline*	383
Letters by T. W. Parsons, edited by Zoltán Haraszti	*Tremaine McDowell*	385
The Dana Saga: Three Centuries of the Dana Family in Cambridge, by H. W. L. Dana	*J. D. Hart*	386
The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas, by Carl Becker, and The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783–1860, by S. E. Morison	*Perry Miller*	387
Short Notices		389
Notes Concerning the National Archives at Washington		393
Notes on Contributors		395
Donors to the New England Quarterly		396

THE NEW ENGLAND QUARTERLY

JUNE, 1942

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS

THE *New England Quarterly*, like all other American institutions, is subject to the alterations and vicissitudes brought about by the War. One such change is the temporary withdrawal of Mr. Morison from active connection with the Board of Editors, to serve as Lieutenant Commander, U.S.N.R., at Washington, where he is attached to the Office of the Secretary of the Navy with special duties of a confidential nature. Still another member of the Board is awaiting call to duty in the Army. During Mr. Morison's absence, Mr. Schlesinger will act as editor-in-chief of the *Quarterly*.

Another change will be apparent in the reduced form of this issue. This size—approximately one hundred and fifty pages—will probably be maintained throughout the War. Since the printer providently laid in an advance supply of the stock on which the *Quarterly* is printed, it is hoped that the customary format and make-up of the periodical may be continued, as well as the quality of its literary content.

In order that the last-named hope may be realized, the editors solicit the assistance of scholars and writers in the New England field, some of whom may not be subject to call for other national services, in keeping the *Quarterly* supplied with historical and critical essays and documents of permanent value, which may in some instances be none the less authoritative if they are timely as well.

THE FRONTIER AND AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS
A CRITICISM OF THE TURNER THEORY

GEORGE WILSON PIERSON

HOW much of Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier hypothesis is reliable and useful today? This problem has begun to trouble economists, sociologists, geographers, and most of all the teachers of graduate students in the field of American history.

For how shall we account for the industrial revolution by the frontier? Do American music and architecture come from the woods? Did American cattle? Were our religions born of the contemplation of untamed nature? Has science, poetry, or even democracy, its cradle in the wilderness? Did literature grow fertile with innovation in the open spaces? Above all, what happens to intellectual history if the environment be all?

The predicament of the scholar, who has been living in a comfortable frontier philosophy, is beginning to attract some attention. Nor may we comfort ourselves with the assurance that ours is a purely academic debate. For frontier legends of one kind or another have now so permeated American thought as to threaten drastic consequences. Have not our most influential journalists and statesmen for some time been ringing *pessimistic* changes on the theme of "lost frontier," "lost safety-valve," "lost opportunity"? [1] Such convic-

[1] Recently, at Union College, President Dixon Ryan Fox pointed out how the Turner doctrine has tended to encourage defeatism during the last decade. Too many prophets have argued that the disappearance of free frontier land means the disappearance of opportunity. On the contrary, said President Fox, the word frontier ought to mean merely "the edge of the unused." In science, in business, in arts, challenge remains. "A failure now ... would not be a failure of opportunity; it would be a failure of nerve."

I am indebted to President Fox for permission to quote from his address, and for some most pertinent suggestions; also, for criticism and encouragement to Charles A. Beard, to Professors Leonard W. Labaree and James G. Leyburn of Yale University, and to Professor Richard H. Shryock of the University of Pennsylvania.

tions can lead to legislation. In Congress the underlying issue could shortly be: was there but one economic frontier, was it really a "safety-valve," and are both now gone? The cultural historian meanwhile asks: is it true that the frontier was "the line of most rapid and effective Americanization"? More particularly, since we are now trying to define and safeguard the "American way of life," what share did the "frontier" have in its creation, and to what cultural influences must we henceforth look for its preservation?

No matter how phrased, these questions are fundamental. They suggest a serious re-study of our premises. And the place to begin, the present writer has concluded, is with Professor Turner's own theories in the matter: that is, with his celebrated and influential essays on the significance of the American frontier.[2]

My proposal is, therefore, first to re-examine, and then overhaul, what Professor Turner wrote on the relation of the frontier to American institutions. For his brilliant papers have been the Bible, and today still constitute the central inspiration, of an extraordinary and widely-held faith. That such an investigation may lead us to question, or in particulars abandon entirely, the doctrine once taught us by a beloved man is unfortunately only too obvious. But that this autopsy is necessary is the argument of the considerations advanced above, and the theme of much that follows.

How was it then—according to the essays—that the frontier affected American institutions?[3] What really was Turner's

[2] The reference is to Turner's first great exposition of 1893, called "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," and to the twelve other essays or papers in this field: the whole collected and republished under the title *The Frontier in American History* (New York, 1920; hereinafter, "Turner"). Page citations in my analysis will be to this volume. I am much indebted to the publishers for permission to quote freely.

[3] Attention in this paper will be confined to *institutional* results because, in a preliminary study, "The Frontier and Frontiersmen of Turner's Essays," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, LXIV, 4 (October, 1940; hereinafter, "Pierson"), 449–478, I have already subjected both Turner's definition of what the frontier *was*, and his interpretation of how it influenced the *persons* it touched, to scrutiny and challenge.

theory in this matter—and what examples did he give to support his theory? Finally, is this part of his doctrine a reasonable and useful guide to students of American history today?

The Theory of How the "Frontier" Affected American Institutions

First of all, a careful study of Turner's thirteen essays makes it plain that in theory he recognized, as all of us must do, the European origins of New World society. To the "germ theory" school of Johns Hopkins he readily conceded thus much: that the first germs of things now American had (two or three centuries before) been European. "In the settlement of America we have to observe how European life entered the continent," he wrote in 1893. "... Our early history is the study of European germs developing in an American environment" (page 3).

Again, Turner was willing to make two further concessions to Old World influence. In the late nineteenth century, immigrants and institutions could still be observed, pouring into the Ohio Valley and the frontier areas farther West. Of these outsiders, some were from the East, but many were obviously coming straight from Europe. Hence resulted, as Turner himself insisted, a foreign accretion to frontier society—and a sort of rural melting-pot. In the second place, the Atlantic seaboard meanwhile had remained steadily subject to the influence and suggestions of the Old World (294–295). In the East there was an obvious "tendency to adjust to a European type" (282, 68, *et passim*).

Notwithstanding such concessions, of course, Turner stated and restated many times a conviction that these Old World germs were not the really significant factors in our national evolution. Even in the shaping of social institutions they were merely the roots, the remote background, the undistinguished platform from which a new departure could be taken. And here it was that the frontier entered. For in

Turner's view the frontier was the most important single influence in effecting that new departure. It turned European things into American things. The longer it operated, and the farther the frontier got from the Atlantic Coast, the more overwhelming became its influence. "Too exclusive attention has been paid by institutional students to the Germanic origins, too little to the American factors," Turner insisted.

> The frontier is the line of most rapid and effective Americanization. The wilderness masters the colonist. It finds him a European in dress, industries, tools, modes of travel, and thought.... It strips off the garments of civilization.... It puts him in the log cabin ... and runs an Indian palisade around him.... Little by little he transforms the wilderness, but the outcome is not the old Europe, not simply the development of Germanic germs.... The fact is, that here is a new product that is American.... Thus the advance of the frontier has meant a steady movement away from the influence of Europe, a steady growth of independence on American lines (3–4).

And the grand proposal winds up with the conclusion that the novelties in American civilization finally became so successful and powerful as to react on the seaboard and on Europe itself.

By what *means* did the frontier exert so powerful a force upon society? How did it grasp an institution, tear it apart, and remold it so effectively? In his essays Turner never formulated his interpretation very succinctly. Rather he was inclined to exploit a whole congeries of explanations, shifting the burden of proof as circumstances seemed to warrant. A fair summary of his views can perhaps be organized under two heads.

First of all, as demonstrated in my analysis of his "frontier" and "frontiersmen," Turner thought of the frontier as a physical, even a savage, environment.[4] At the frontier this

---

[4] See Turner, 4, 210, *et passim;* also Pierson, 454–459 and 465–467.

environment was "at first too strong" for the institution, even as for the man. In a word, the wilderness "mastered" the European germs by forcing the pioneer to abandon civilized ways entirely and start completely over. "American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier" (2). On the other hand, whenever total elimination was not achieved, the frontier changed old ways by modifying them: that is, by forcing at least some adjustments to new physical conditions. Again, as previously stated, a new product was sometimes created through the amalgamation of populations coming from diverse countries, by a sort of rural melting-pot process (22–23). In the fourth place, the constant repetition of exposure to the new-world environment had a cumulative effect. Finally, it seems that sheer movement and migration, particularly the repetition of the pioneer business of picking up and moving on, resulted in the loss of cultural baggage on the road.

By way of a first, parenthetical criticism, it may be pointed out that this last explanation goes rather far afield. At least, it illustrates the shifting character of Turner's concept of the frontier, and raises the serious question whether the woods and migration belong in the same definition, or can have engendered identical results. If so, how are we to regard internal population movements (such as that from farm to city) that had nothing to do with the frontier? Again, what of the other great colonial migrations, to Canada, South America, and the East? Did the vast population drifts of the Mediterranean regions, or the expansion of the Norse to Iceland and the coasts of Europe, have effects comparable to those claimed for the American frontier? And are we to describe the tremendous migration of the Chinese to Manchuria in recent years in language out of Turner's essays?[5]

Clearly we have here the problem of how travel or move-

[5] I am indebted to Professor K. Asakawa of Yale University, and to Professor Owen Lattimore of the Johns Hopkins University, for stimulating comment on this point.

ment affect group discipline and culture. What scholars need is less emphasis on the concept "frontier" and a deeper comparative study of migrations around the earth. Meanwhile, it may fairly be suggested that not all migrations that we have known, even in our own history, have had similar cultural effects. If movement into the Ohio Valley was disintegrating, the journey of the Pilgrims and the march of the Mormons must have been disciplinary, integrating experiences of the severest sort. But let us return to our exposition.

Thus far, Turner may be said to have been thinking of the frontier primarily in terms of nature, of geography, of physical environment. Accordingly his hypothesis postulates a kind of geographic or environmental determinism. He had not fully developed this interpretation, however, before he intruded into his definition of "frontier"—and so into his whole hypothesis—certain moral or social meanings. As I have demonstrated elsewhere, the frontier was not merely *place* and *population*, that is to say a savage wilderness and a sparse society of trappers, herders, and pioneers. It was also *process*, or more specifically the processes of conquering the continent, of moving westward, of changing from Europeans into Americans. Whether such irregularity in definition can any longer be tolerated in our use of the hypothesis is a question which has been raised before[6] and will be recurred to. At this point, let it suffice to note that, in contrast to the geographic or natural explanations already listed, this wider concept of "frontier" introduced social and psychological reasons to account for the transformation of our institutions. Principally, the settling business affected European germs by first affecting the germ-carriers. First the wilderness process altered the character and attitudes of the men, then the men inevitably changed their institutions.

Thus, the differentiation and the Americanization of our society took place because European men, in the course of

---

[6] Pierson, 462–465.

westward migration, took on the qualities that Turner chose to regard as distinctively American. Perhaps a brief recapitulation of "Americanisms" may clarify this point. Engulfed in the onward rushing torrent, fur traders, herders, and pioneers, Middle- and Far-Westerners, changed: *i.e.*, they became individualistic, optimistic, and democratic, courageous and aggressive, energetic and ambitious, rough and ready and careless of niceties, nervous and restless and adventurous, volatile and changeful, practical and materialistic; best of all, idealistic.[7] Obviously, so great a human transformation could not but have a profound influence on the societal organism. The frontier force was operating indirectly, perhaps, but none the less powerfully. From geographic determinism, therefore, the argument had passed, by deceptively easy stages, over to a determinism of a decidedly different sort. Whether or not he fully realized the fact, Turner tended increasingly to rely for his explanations on propositions based on a sort of social psychology.

Of the two major means or forces thus postulated, now one could be detected in obvious operation on the body of inherited institutions, now another. More often the frontier as place and the frontier as social process were entangled and intertwined. Whether alone or together, however, these two forces had in theory certain clear-cut and ascertainable effects. They produced novelty or Americanism in our institutions along general and common lines. Let us ourselves pass, therefore, from cause and from means to an analysis of frontier results.

First of all, the essays put overwhelming theoretical emphasis on what might be called the *idealistic improvement* that the frontier introduced into our institutions. In part, as already hinted, improvement came from deliberate elimination of what was old, oppressive, and unwanted. The American wilderness enabled European peoples to leave behind aristoc-

---

[7] Pierson, 468–476.

racies, privileges, monopolies, and vested interests of all kinds. Hence, automatically, an increase in equality and individual opportunity. In fact, so much that was frozen and institutional was intentionally abandoned that society tended to become "atomic," and individual man once more could match his stature against the strength of his institutions—the persistent enslaving systems—that he or his fathers had organized.[8]

Idealistic improvement came also from the simplification or reduction of many of these institutions which were not deliberately left behind. Others were pruned or modified. Finally, by sheer invention of devices calculated to promote a happier society, the new men of the New World moved forward toward the creation of a new and better civilization (better, in the author's opinion, because more free). Turner was apparently so confident that the results of our frontier experience were liberating, and on the whole beneficent, that the very language of his essays in dealing with this subject took on a warm and almost lyric quality. He urged American historians to study "this advance"; he sang the epic of the "imperial domain"; he returned again and again to the confident theory that idealism and innovation and democracy and opportunity flourished on the frontier as nowhere else in the United States. "From the time the mountains rose between the pioneer and the seaboard, a new order of Americanism arose" (18).[9]

So much for the main line of development, the line of improvement. The reader comes now to the fact that under the pressure of the frontier there had also to be some loss. Turner himself admitted that one of the effects of our experience with so vast and rich a continent was to make men a little careless and wasteful, a little materialistic and anti-

---

[8] The echo of Rousseau is too strong here to be overlooked. Note also the old American theme of a corrupt and tyrannical Europe.

[9] For contrast, see Dixon Ryan Fox's statement that for long years the student of civilization "as he went west, found himself going down stairs. . . ." "Refuse Ideas and their Disposal," in *Ideas in Motion* (New York, 1935), 125.

intellectual. At the same time the raw and savage wilderness could not but be unfriendly to the delicacies and refinements of civilization, to certain higher arts, and to the skills of the more populous and cultivated regions. Hence a kind of unplanned loss. If not positively hostile to morality and the social decencies, the Westerner was often indifferent to much that would have enriched his life and his new society. And if not indifferent, then he was all too frequently helpless.

Yet the essays hardly overemphasize such defects. They are admitted as a modest balance in a thesis that on the whole attributes an extraordinary amount of influence, and an extraordinary number of beneficial results, to a partly geographic, partly sociological, frontier.

So much for pure theory. If, in the interest of a fair summary, we now postpone detailed criticism, and pass directly to a restatement of Turner's supporting evidence, one observation may nevertheless be intruded. Apparently the optimism, the buoyant localism, and the anti-European nationalism are as strong in Turner's institutional genetics as in his treatment of Western character.[10] Whether such preferences can any longer be justified in sociological theory, or maintained by historical evidence, is of course another question.

The Practical Results for Social Institutions

Let us examine next the specific proofs or illustrations advanced by Turner in the demonstration of his hypothesis. What examples did he give in his essays; what signs of frontier influence on American institutions are we advised to see?

Taking the effects in inverse order of importance, and gathering the scattered proofs together so as to bring them to bear at the appropriate points, we have first of all a series of statements indicating loss: a necessary or deliberate *aban-*

[10] Pierson, 464–465 and 476–478.

donment. Specifically, the material and psychological forces of the frontier are stated as having eliminated from our social inheritance the highest arts and skills. In these essays, it should be noted, Turner tended to repeat his examples, instead of elaborating or adding to them. So we find repeated statements that fine arts, literature, science, social niceties, and even the higher skills in government were necessarily sacrificed.[11] "Art, literature, refinement, scientific administration, all had to give way to this Titanic labor," he wrote in 1896 in his essay on "The Problem of the West" (211). Again, in 1901, in applying his hypothesis to the Middle West, it seemed to him that "If the task of reducing the Province of the Lake and Prairie Plains to the uses of civilization should for a time overweigh art and literature, and even high political and social ideals, it would not be surprising" (156). Again in 1910, Turner found himself urging the state university to call forth the individualism of the pioneer for finer uses: the state university "must honor the poet and painter, the writer and the teacher, the scientist and the inventor, the musician and the prophet of righteousness—the men of genius in all fields who make life nobler" (288).[12] In particular, it sometimes seemed to him that frontier democracy had "destroyed the ideals of statesmanship" (216). It refused to recognize the value or need of specialization, training, or experience in the business of government (357). It substituted rotation in office and the spoils system. It even destroyed or disregarded the codes of social and business morality (32).

---

11 Had Turner devoted much thought to the arts, in relation to the environment, he would perhaps have given more attention to architecture.

12 That is to say, the pioneering state university should honor precisely those skills and those specialists the real pioneers cared least about.

The optimistic but unfortunate employment of a word in two different senses is by no means unusual in these essays. No doubt most such errors were as unintentional and unconscious as the case here underlined. Yet they reveal Professor Turner in rather cloudy thinking; and the worst of it is that for us such lapses in precision, such vagaries of definition, subtly and slowly convert what at first seemed a brilliant illumination into a golden but impenetrable mist.

Needless to say, consequences of this sort rather disturbed the champion of the frontier. Yet, as several of the foregoing extracts indicate, he was able to regard the losses as forced more by circumstance than by character, and as a temporary evil in any case. When the forest was felled, and soil and freedom were won, then the refinements of life would once again be possible. Turner's essays rank him clearly among those who defend the "cultural" shortcomings of the American people on the ground of want of time. The finer arts had simply been postponed. "As we turn from the task of the first rough conquest of the continent, there lies before us a whole wealth of unexploited resources in the realm of the spirit," was his optimistic way of recognizing the problem (309).[13] Such confidence is soothing and encouraging. Yet one may be forgiven for noticing the gulf that at this point opened before Turner's feet. If his essays mean what they appear to mean, then the doctrine is that we were most American just when we were least cultivated.[14]

To put the case a little more generously, it may perhaps be arguable that it was the novelties—not the (temporary) losses—that spelled Americanism. Yet if so, how were these innovators to remain "American," and still by and by begin to import the special skills and higher arts from Europe? Turner did not say. Rather, one suspects, the answer is to be found in the fact that the refinements, present or absent, constituted for him a very small proportion of what was fundamentally important. His definition of "culture" was

[13] Are the arts more encouraged by a rich than by a poor natural environment? May not hardship drive certain peoples to the solace of religion and the cult of beauty? Conversely, may not the materialism which sometimes results from economic success smother the artistic elements in a society? I cannot pretend to know. But sometimes it looks as if it were the drive, the will of a given population, that really mattered. Not all the hardships or poverty of history have apparently been able to squeeze out of the Jews their artistic cravings. Vice versa, Americans have sometimes given the impression of indifference, of lack of interest, rather than of any want of opportunity or time.

[14] Notice the contradiction with Turner's optimism, and the agreement with the position of Dixon Ryan Fox, cited above.

perhaps not unlike what we often think of as the typical nineteenth-century American definition. A cultivated, progressive society had four parts and only four: government, business, education, and religion.[15] And the essence of these was freedom.

In the second place, according to the essays, under the pressure of the frontier our ancestral institutions and ways showed signs of *partial disintegration* and simplification. Such effects were especially noticeable in religion, finance, the law, agriculture, and group discipline.

In the field of religion, the frontier encouraged the explosion of the Protestant Church into sects and hampered religious organization. It led the pioneers out beyond the reach of all but the most indefatigable Eastern missionary. At the same time it made what worship there was a more emotional and less intellectual performance (36, 112, 165). In the field of business and finance, the pioneer developed a debtor-class psychology, a grudge against banks, and a relaxed notion of business integrity. Paper-money agitation and wild-cat banking were strong in the interior and agricultural regions (32, 210, 249). As for the law and the courts, Turner "refrained from dwelling on the lawless characteristics of the frontier, because they are sufficiently well known." He did mention the squatter, also (once each) the gambler and the desperado, the rustler and the lumber thief, and on one occasion he even called them "types of that line of scum that the waves of advancing civilization bore before them" (32–33, 272–273). Generally, however, it seemed to him sufficient to stress the frontiersman's impatience of restraints, his notion of the personality of the law, and particularly "the growth of spontaneous organs of authority" in the shape of regulators and vigilantes "where legal authority was absent" (33, 212, 254, *et passim*). Squatter sovereignty, noted Turner, was a "favorite Western political idea" (140). Finally, in the social and economic

[15] I hope to be able to develop the implications of this parallel in another place.

organization of the people there was a very obvious decentralization and simplification. Civilization became atomic. "Complex society is precipitated by the wilderness into a kind of primitive organization based on the family. The tendency is anti-social" (30). The tendency was also toward ethical crudity, toward ruthlessness. "The backwoodsman was intolerant of men who split hairs, or scrupled over the method of reaching the right" (254).

Thus far our analysis has relisted the destructive and regrettable results of the long and repeated exposure to primitive conditions. It is now in order to remind ourselves that Turner in his essays treated such tendencies as incidental, as unfortunate by-products of a much larger and sounder process. For the frontier could be *creative and transforming*, as well as hostile to social institutions. By what we today might call selection and cross-breeding, by psychological suggestion, even by direct material command, important *changes* were wrought in our institutions.

In the field of education, for example, despite initial handicaps, great novelties were achieved. The state universities of the Middle West, Turner thought, had been "shaped under pioneer ideals," and from them had come "the fuller recognition of scientific studies, and especially those of applied science devoted to the conquest of nature; the breaking down of the traditional required curriculum; the union of vocational and college work in the same institution; the development of agricultural and engineering colleges and business courses . . ." (283).[16] In a later passage, Turner likewise

[16] The point cannot be argued at length here, but the reader will surely wish to look again at the essay "Pioneer Ideals and the State University." How little of what is new even our state universities owe to the environment of the frontier or the West, and how much to the inspiration of England, Germany, Switzerland, and France, one would never guess from these pages. "Other universities do the same thing," Turner admitted; "but the head springs and the main current of this great stream of tendency come from the land of the pioneers, the democratic states of the Middle West."

In 1918 the author modified his position to the extent of conceding that "the State Universities were for the most part the result of agitation and

credited the democratic state universities with becoming "coeducational at an early date" (354).

More extensive and notable were the influences exercised by the frontier on our economy, and through our economy on our whole way of life. The continent determined the successive economic occupations. And as the hunter gave way to the herder, the cattleman to the pioneer, the unskilled pioneer to the intensive farmer, this farmer finally to the manufacturer, "the evolution of each into a higher stage has worked political transformations" (11–12). As Indian trails grew into turnpikes and railroads, so the Indian villages—likewise located by nature—gave way to trading posts, and these to cities (14). The land systems of the first Piedmont frontier—or "Old West"—set the precedents for the trans-Allegheny West, and so led to the national land policy, the preëmption acts, and finally, the Homestead Act (122, 170). The same back-country area in the Colonial Period "began the movement of internal trade," developed markets, and so started the slow diminution of the dependence of the Colonies on England, just as later the salt springs of the Ohio Valley freed the pioneers from dependence on the coast (108, 18, 24). The frontier, particularly as it moved away from the coast, first forced the Eastern states to fear for their population, next drew the seaports into a rivalry for its trade, and finally lured the city men from the sea into attempts to master the interior (24, 190). The crossing of the mountains put fire into Eastern veins. The problems and opportunities of the Ohio Valley proved "a tonic to this stock" (166). The "imperial resources of the great interior" engaged "the most vital activities of the whole nation" (179, 178). At last the Great Plains handed the individualist farmer his first defeat; and the Mississippi Valley became "the inciting factor in the industrial life of the nation" (147, 194). Meanwhile, the

proposals of men of New England origin; but they became characteristic products of Middle Western society" (354)! In 1920, nevertheless, the assertions of the earlier essay were reprinted without qualification.

competition of the cheap lands and the drainage of the labor supply "meant an upward lift to the Eastern wage earner"; and if the mining and industrial opportunities produced a division between employer and employed, the frontier provided a safety-valve. As Turner put this matter, "the sanative influences of the free spaces of the West were destined to ameliorate labor's condition, to afford new hopes and new faith to pioneer democracy, and to postpone the problem" (193, 275, 303). Again, it was from the Piedmont and interior areas that the opposition to slavery always came (122, 173). Finally, in distinct disagreement with the North *versus* South school of interpretation of the ante-bellum period, Turner insisted that "the legislation which most developed the power of the national government, and played the largest part in its activity, was conditioned on the frontier" (24).

At this point, certain fundamental objections can no longer be postponed. In the first place, whatever may be decided as to the Piedmont (hence frontier?) origins of our land survey and sale policies, of our preëmption acts and Homestead Act, a crucial problem remains. If, as the hypothesis suggests, those first policies set precedents, if also "the squatters of Pennsylvania and the Carolinas found it easy to repeat the operation on another frontier" (122–123), what happens to the principle of originality? Here, on a small scale, we stumble into a persistent difficulty. The frontier offered novel problems, hence novelty. On the other hand, the influence of the frontier was strengthened because the exposure to it was repeated: hence copying—especially as copying was so "easy." In this instance, ought not the sale of land in rigid squares and sections—(a most awkward device in rough country)—to have yielded to some new and happier invention? And this, in turn, perhaps to a third, as the frontier moved westward? The implications of such questions are rather arresting.

A second far-reaching doubt arises over Turner's "imperial resources." For here, once again, we have the "frontier" being

stretched to cover the whole West, and this West being defined in terms of resources. If salt, and coal, and oil, and the wealth of the continent were really the causes of institutional change, ought we not to separate them out from the frontier concept?[17]

Most dubious of all, perhaps, is the statement about the sanative and ameliorating influences of the free spaces. Granted that the exact influence and duration of the frontier as safety-valve are still under dispute, nevertheless, one conclusion seems to me inescapable. What really mattered was whether the frontier and its free land *seemed* to offer an escape, a chance to start over again. We could have had—and probably did have—land to burn, and it would have done us no good if the average man no longer saw any attraction in it. When cars, movies, and radios become essentials of the accepted standard of living, subsistence farming is repugnant even to the starving. Measured, therefore, against this concept of a changing fashion or standard of living, it may be suggested that the lure of the land began in Tudor England, before there was any available, and ceased in the United States before the available supply gave out.[18]

---

[17] Note also how nature "incites" man, how inert minerals are made to draw a whole society into new forms of economy. Professor Labaree remarks on the failure of cotton fields to produce cotton mills, at least in the older South. But perhaps this region "incited" Manchester and Liverpool instead?

Again, according to Turnerian logic, Wilberforce and the English anti-slavery movement ought to derive from the frontier—whereas in fact the free lands of the deep South and the Southwest seem to have prolonged the career of the peculiar institution, and to have made its asperities somewhat harsher. See the reference to this point in Pierson, 471.

The ancestry and naiveté of geographical determinism have been remarked by many scholars. For an excellent resumé by Louis Wirth, see *Critiques of Research in the Social Sciences*, III (New York, 1940), 179–184.

[18] For confirmation of this point of view, see the illuminating remarks of Isaiah Bowman in *The Pioneer Fringe* (American Geographical Society Special Publication No. 13, 1931), 5, 41, 74, 81, *et passim*.

In his most suggestive book *The Golden Day* (New York, 1926), page 55, Lewis Mumford has stated this point as follows: "In America the return to Nature set in before there was any physical necessity for filling up the raw lands of the West. The movement across the Alleghenies began long before the East was fully occupied: ... by the time the nineteenth century was under

Returning to our exposition, it is now in order to recall the tremendous emphasis and enthusiasm that Turner's hypothesis puts into the *political aspects* of frontier influence. For if our experience with the wilderness forced alterations in religion and education, in laws and in economy, it positively transformed our public administration, policies, and theory of government.

To begin, the frontier (mainly as a compelling geography) is regarded as having created and fostered sectionalism. In the Colonial Period this frontier-as-geography divided New England from Virginia, and the Middle Region from both. Later it accentuated the disharmony between North and South and set the East off from the new West. Even within the West there came to be regions whose special interests were soon reflected in industry and politics. "Indeed, the United States is, in size and natural resources, an empire, a collection of potential nations, rather than a single nation," Turner wrote. As a result its federalism would "be found to lie in the relation of sections and nation, rather than in the relation of States and nation" (158–159, 20, 52, 115, 120, 321).[19]

In not dissimilar fashion, the size and resources of the frontier West had a striking influence on foreign and domestic politics. The acquisition of Louisiana, for example, was "decisive" in setting the United States "on an independent

---

way, the conquest of the Continent had become the obsession of every progressive community."

The difference between the frontier, as actual opportunity, and this romantic European agrarianism needs clear definition.

[19] Could the influence of the frontier be uniform and centralizing, yet at the same time lead to sectionalism? Perhaps, in the sense that all frontiers, however much they differed among themselves, might have certain limited characteristics in common. To get an *increased* nationalism and an *increased* sectionalism out of the same forest is clearly a little more difficult.

It may be argued that this part of the hypothesis should be corrected by a reading of what Turner later published on "Sections." Yet Turner himself failed to repudiate his earlier statements; and what such a repudiation would have done to the "nationalizing" influence of the frontier may be gathered from the exposition that follows.

career as a world power, free from entangling alliances." Again, the same expansion, by overcoming Jefferson's strict constructionism and by "swamping the New England section and its Federalism," revolutionized our political system (189, 25).

Most important of all by far, of course, the frontier made us national and made us democratic. The nationalizing influence of the frontier could hardly, it seemed to Turner, be exaggerated. It enforced unity and encouraged patriotism in many obvious and tangible ways. The menace of the Indians and the French made the frontier a consolidating agent, suggested the Albany Congress of 1754, and led to the building of forts and the creation of a national army (15–16). Again, the frontier was geographically more unified than the seaboard. Thus, toward the end of the Colonial Period, the Piedmont frontier "stretched along the western border like a cord of union" (15); while later the Mississippi Valley transfixed the barrier set up by the slavery dispute. In the third place, the mobility of population and the ease of interior communication prevented the development of provincialism (29). In the fourth place, the empty frontier regions became the melting-pot of European stocks, and even the New Englander tended to lose "the acuteness of his sectionalism" on the way through New York and Pennsylvania to the West (23, 27–28). Again, "the economic and social characteristics of the frontier worked against sectionalism"; the Middle-Western frontier developed special needs; hostility to class and regional privilege fostered a co-operative point of view; and the abuses of the railroads and Eastern monopolies led to appeals for protection to the national government. Inevitably the frontier regions were soon trying to realize their interests in legislation. "Loose construction advanced as the nation marched westward" (25, 170–171, 189–190).

By this last, Turner meant to suggest that the frontier was responsible for much nationalistic legislation by the Federal Government, particularly in the economic field. Furthermore,

such enactments automatically increased the strength of the Union and its government for general purposes thereafter. To quote Turner's proposition again, "the legislation which most developed the powers of the national government, and played the largest part in its activity, was conditioned on the frontier." "The pioneer needed the goods of the coast, and so the grand series of internal improvement and railroad legislation began, with potent nationalizing effects." "The public domain has been a force of profound importance in the nationalization and development of the government." "Administratively the frontier called out some of the highest and most vitalizing activities of the general government" (24–25). Such repetition of thought, within a very few pages, can be duplicated elsewhere in the essays (*e.g.*, 168–173) and gives a fair idea of the emphasis and conviction with which Turner kept returning to this favorite idea of his about the nationalizing influence of the frontier. Yet this last example or proof of frontier influence presents such curious internal inconsistencies that the commentator cannot forbear to pause a moment.

What Turner was thinking of, and cited again and again, was the tariff, banking, and internal improvement legislation of the period of Henry Clay on the one hand—and on the other, the Western protest movements, with their proposals for the control and reform of big business by national legislation, in the era after the Civil War.

As to the first, it is well known that Clay found supporters for his "American system" in the Ohio Valley, but is it necessary to infer that genuine frontiersmen supported the idea of the tariff or were in favor of the National Bank? The pioneers may have voted for Clay on other grounds, and in any case they appear to have voted at least as heavily for Andrew Jackson, whose opinions on the tariff were nebulous and whose views on the bank were almost unprintable. A similar fate overtakes the case for internal improvements, that is, for the theory that the frontier led the central government into

the building of roads and canals. What Jackson did to the Maysville Bill is familiar to us all. And what had happened to J. Q. Adams's really national program is surely no secret. As a matter of fact, in another connection, but without realizing that he was destroying his own argument, Turner stated the case exactly. He quoted Adams as confessing "My own system of administration, which was to make the national domain the inexhaustible fund for progressive and unceasing internal improvement, has failed." Then Turner gave the reason. "The reason is obvious; a system of administration was not what the West demanded; it wanted land" (26). That is to say, the West wanted land far more than it wanted the federal government to go into any grand series of internal improvements. How had Turner been led into his error? The answer seems to be: he had equated the West and the continent with "frontier"; and the more densely settled this area became, the more it, as frontier, would demand internal improvements. The futility of this equation for any purposes of exact thinking is perhaps beginning to be clear.

As for the Granger and Populist and Progressive crusades, which were in part pioneer Western and which did have nationalistic implications, the difficulty is this: what had happened to the ineradicably self-reliant, *laissez-faire* individualism of the Kansas frontiersmen to make them throw up their hands? And whence came the inspiration and the very shape of the reforms they advocated?

It would seem that Turner's evidence in the matter of internal improvements, and the nationalizing effect of the frontier on economic legislation, needs further study.

But that "the most important effect of the frontier has been in the promotion of democracy here and in Europe," Turner was positive. He said so in his first great essay (30) and he stuck to the point right through to the end. The argument ran approximately as follows: the forest, the dangers, the lonely helplessness of life in the American wilderness, made the frontiersmen individualistic and self-reliant. At the same

time, the deliberate abandonment of European societies and the separation from the more densely settled communities of the seaboard, together with the difficulties of the journey and the confusion of races and types in the new settlements,[20] tended to destroy old social disciplines, old class arrangements, old privileges and superiorities. Finally, and most important of all, the extraordinary wealth of the continent, particularly the opportunity represented by the free land, gave everyone a chance to become as wealthy and self-respecting as his neighbor. Hence, the creation of a race of optimists and democrats. From democrats and from the frontier surroundings, of course, came democratic institutions.

To review Turner's presentation of this argument would require many pages,[21] but a few quotations may be useful in establishing the poetic and dogmatic flavor of his pronouncements as stated in these famous essays. "The frontier is productive of individualism," he announced (30). "The frontier individualism has from the beginning promoted democracy" (30). "Liberty and equality flourished in the frontier periods of the Middle West as perhaps never before in history" (153–154). "The Mississippi Valley has been the especial home of democracy" (190, 183). More particularly "American democracy came from the forest" (154). In translation, the word "forest" could mean many things, but generally the ingredients seem to be one part hardship, three parts free land. "Most important of all has been the fact that an area of free land has continually lain on the western border" (259). These free lands were the "gate of escape." They "promoted individualism, economic equality, freedom to rise, democracy." "In a word, then, free lands meant free opportunities.

---

20 Note again the incorporation of non-frontier factors within the symbol "frontier."

21 For example, it is not always clear what Turner meant by the word "democrats"; it is, as Beard warns, by no means certain that there ever was much "individualism" on the frontier; and one would hardly guess from Turner's pages how inharmonious free opportunity and equalitarianism sometimes are (Pierson, 468–472).

Their existence has differentiated the American democracy from the democracies which have preceded it" (259–260). Finally, in 1914, twenty-one years after his first optimistic rebellion against the germ theory of American development, Turner put his thoughts into their most challenging and controversial form (293):

> American democracy was born of no theorist's dream; it was not carried in the *Sarah Constant* to Virginia, nor in the *Mayflower* to Plymouth. It came out of the American forest, and it gained new strength each time it touched a new frontier. Not the constitution, but free land and an abundance of natural resources open to a fit people, made the democratic type of society in America for three centuries while it occupied its empire.

If this was so, what democratic institutions in particular did the American forest produce? Apparently most of those that had gained repute since 1775. First, of course, came the reforms of the Revolution and the Jeffersonian period: the abolition of entail and primogeniture, the disestablishment of the churches, the demands for public education and the abolition of slavery. "Jefferson was the first prophet of American democracy, and when we analyse the essential features of his gospel, it is clear that the Western influence was the dominant element" (250, 114).[22] From the Mississippi Valley in the thirties came manhood suffrage and all the reforms of Jacksonian democracy, including that for the elimination of imprisonment for debt (192). In the forties and fifties came new state constitutions with provisions for an elective judiciary. Finally, after the Civil War, the Mississippi Valley and the Plains gave birth to the Granger and Greenback movements, and to the Populist crusade. Bryan Democracy and the Republicanism of Theodore Roosevelt "were Mississippi Valley ideals in action" (203–204).

[22] The student will note that T. P. Abernethy is also skeptical of the frontier explanation of Thomas Jefferson. See especially his Author's Preface to *Three Virginia Frontiers* (University of Louisiana, 1940), x.

The reader will recall that Benjamin F. Wright and a number of others have long since perceived and stated the surprising poverty of at least certain frontier areas in democracy and in political invention. Yet a few additional queries may legitimately be raised at this point. For instance, are we really prepared to ascribe the platform of the Populists and the reforms of Progressivism to the frontier? Does not the history of social legislation in England and on the Continent indicate a quite different explanation? Again, it would appear that the woman suffrage idea originated in Europe and found but slim support in the Ohio Valley. The direct dependence of our belated Civil Service legislation on the earlier English movement will be apparent to anyone who cares to investigate that subject. As for manhood suffrage, whatever may have been the contributions of the wilderness frontier, is it not hard to believe that the American democrat sprang, as it were, full-armed, ballot in hand, out of the Western woods? Surely one cannot today dismiss the long evolution of Parliament, the history of Colonial legislatures, the methods of the New England town meeting, the self-government of Congregational churches, and the voting habits of trading-company stockholders without a thought. This leads to another disconcerting observation. Turner nowhere seriously credits Anglo-American Protestantism (what Tocqueville so discerningly called our "republican religion") with democratic tendencies. One is left to infer that such equalitarian and humanitarian interests as American Christianity has displayed must have derived from the experience of conquering the West.

Thus, to conclude our exposition of the Turner hypothesis, the West's "steady influence toward democracy" was not without its influence on the East, and on Europe. It was not until the early nineteenth century, and then "largely by reason of the drainage of population to the West, and the stir in the air raised by the Western winds of Jacksonian democracy, that most of the older States reconstructed their consti-

tutions on a more democratic basis. From the Mississippi Valley . . . came the inspiration for this era of change" (192). The possibility that their citizens might escape to practically free land "compelled the coastwise States to liberalize the franchise; and it prevented the formation of a dominant class, whether based on property or on custom" (274, 30, 172, 185). As for Europe, what it derived from the frontier is less clear. The frontier is asserted to have turned both pioneer and Easterner away from Europe, and to have been the goal of peasant and artisan, the mecca for Europe's idealists and social reformers, through three hundred years (261–262, 349).[23]

"The men of the Mississippi Valley compelled the men of the East to think in American terms instead of European." When cities and sections turned their energies to the interior, "a genuine American culture began" (185, 190).

General Criticism

Turner's theoretical system, with proof and illustration, has now been developed and quoted at sufficient length to enable us to proceed to the next step: an attempt at an overall criticism.

First, then, let me say emphatically that it would seem small-minded to forget or to depreciate the inspiration that these essays originally offered to historians. Nor does it seem that we, of half a century later, have yet heard arguments that would warrant us in discarding the celebrated hypothesis entirely, out of hand. Too much of Turner's interpretation still seems reasonable, and corresponding to fact. Even in so condensed an analysis as has just been offered, the poetic insights and the masterful grasp of an understanding mind

[23] That numerous idealists and reformers were drawn out of old Europe into the new West is certain, but it may be that the empty woods were more hospitable (*i.e.*, less hostile) to Utopian experiments than were frontier populations.

are hardly to be disguised. No blanket repudiation is therefore here to be proposed.

On the other hand, Turner himself did make a number of flat-footed and dogmatic statements, did put forward some highly questionable interpretations, did on occasion guess and not verify, did exaggerate—and stick for more than twenty years to the exaggerations. Hence it would seem that, however badly the master may have been served by his students and continuers in other particulars, these followers have been made the scapegoats a little too hastily. For they have not alone been responsible for the palpable errors and exaggerations that many of the rising generation recognize in the frontier theory as it is stated and applied today. At least they did not invent the safety-valve theory that now looks so dubious; they didn't misquote when they attributed political invention, and most of the reforms and the reformers, to the frontier;[24] they weren't the first local and national patriots. In his work with his students, Turner seems to have been modest and tentative and open-minded to a degree; but in his essays he could be and was as inclusive and sweeping as any have been since.

What were the statements and attitudes which we regard as extreme or with which we would disagree? A number have just been alluded to, or were earlier marked and commented upon. But the treatment has been parenthetical and fragmentary. Let me conclude, therefore, with a brief organization of the most cogent reasons for regarding Turner's original doctrine on the frontier and American institutions as defective and in need of repair.

To begin with the details and proceed to the general, it seems first of all necessary to suggest that—whatever may later be decided about Turner's theory—his evidence and

[24] In an 1899 version of his first great essay, Turner did grant that "the study of the evolution of western institutions shows how slight was the proportion of actual theoretical invention of institutions." But for some reason this reservation was thereafter omitted from his thesis. See *The Early Writings of Frederick Jackson Turner* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1938), 38.

proofs leave much to be desired. I am not here referring to our difficulty in accepting Turner's reasons for believing that the frontier stimulated invention, liberal ideas, educational improvements, or humanitarian reforms—a difficulty that remains substantial enough in itself. Rather, it is the quantity of his evidence to which I would now call attention. How few were his concrete examples, and how often he would repeat them is really astonishing. For twenty-seven years he kept the same happy illustrations, in the same language often, and even perhaps without testing them by fresh investigation. In his first essay Turner invited such testing, and suggested the specific investigation of a number of different frontiers: "It would be a work worth the historian's labors to mark these various frontiers and in detail compare one with another" (10). Yet if one goes to the later frontier essays for demonstration, one finds it only in the most general and vague terms. Undoubtedly, Turner was more interested in discovering than in proving. Undoubtedly, also, he must on occasion have carried his analysis of special areas and his search for positive proof somewhat deeper, particularly in his work with his graduate students and in his study of the different sections. Unfortunately, there is astonishingly little to show for that research in the later essays.

Did Turner, perhaps, on the other hand, put his effort into theory and philosophy, into developing and revising his first grand vision and interpretation? Once again, curiously, our examination indicates that he did not. For not only did he republish his first essay without substantial alteration, but his later essays show little if any advance beyond the position taken in his first. Not only is there small proof of fresh research; there is as little proof of fresh thinking.[25] Elaboration, progress in application, repetition, certainly, but distressingly little in the way of genuine reconsideration or modification.

[25] Considerable awareness of the capture of the Middle West by industrialism appears, but this leads toward discouragement or exhortation rather than to a revision in frontier theory.

If anything, the later essays are more general, sweeping, and blurred—as if the hypothesis had somewhere already been proved. Yet when one turns back to the first statement one is startled to find in it reservations, moderation, and doubt.

A critic is reduced, therefore, to finding the same theory throughout, and is moved to protest at certain aspects of that theory. It is dangerous and ungenerous, I acknowledge, for a man living in a later climate of opinion to disparage the attitude of an earlier day. But since our problem concerns the *present applicability and future usefulness* of these frontier essays, certain assumptions and definitions cannot be allowed to pass without challenge.

As has been pointed out, first of all, the essays are in a high degree unsatisfactory in clarity, or definition. Turner's Master Force is defined and used as area, as population, as process. As if such inharmonious and confusing interpretations were not sufficiently inclusive, this force is then made to cover soil and mineral resources as well,—and at times everything Western, or pre-industrial, or non-European! I think it fair to say that the word "frontier" has been, and will be found again, a Pandora's box of trouble to historians, when opened to such wide interpretation.

Again, there seems to be haziness in the statement of *means*, and real doubt as to many of the *results* claimed for the frontier. At moments the wilderness, and even the flow of our population westward, seem to have been destructive rather than constructive experiences. And when the rebuilding is scrutinized, the proportion of invention looks surprisingly small. In particular, the contribution of the frontier to our educational, economic, and political institutions needs cautious reappraisal.

Once again, the emotional attitudes or assumptions of the author—and of his generation?—color his essays unmistakably. It would have been strange had they not done so. No personal censure is therefore intended. On the other hand, for the interpretation of American history in 1942, the emphasis of

1893 may become a serious handicap; it may even obscure or distort the elements in the theory that are still most meaningful. To be specific, the frontier hypothesis seems—as has been indicated several times already—too optimistic, too romantic, too provincial,[26] and too nationalistic to be reliable in any survey of world history or study in comparative civilization. And it is too narrowly sectional and materialistic—in the sense of assigning deterministic forces to physical environment—to seem any longer a satisfactory gauge for internal cause-measurements. A thoughtful reading of the thirteen essays, or even of such materials as it has been possible to quote in this paper, ought to be conclusive on these defects. Yet perhaps a word more about one or two of them will not be out of place.

At an earlier point in the argument, the migration factor was isolated—as a sort of foreign substance—out of the frontier concept; and it was suggested that, at the least, a comparison with city-ward movements and with migrations the world around is in order. It now seems pertinent to suggest the extension of such comparisons from migration to the *whole story of settlement* or environmental adjustment in South America, Australia, and Africa. Did comparable situations always produce comparable results? Moreover, if we repeat such comparisons *within* the American experience, do we really find much similarity between the frontiers of Colonial Massachusetts, the Mississippi Delta, the Plains, and the mining country? If not, it would appear that the applicability of Turner's frontier hypothesis is far more limited than has been supposed.

Along another line of thought, I have suggested that Turner's views were deterministic. They were almost fatalistic.[27]

[26] The hypothesis is "provincial" in two different ways; it ignores frontiers in other lands, and it slights one whole side of human culture in the United States.

[27] This is shown, in a kind of inverted fashion, by the pessimism to which the disappearance of the safety-valve frontier has given rise. I do not suppose that Turner invented this "escape" concept. The pioneering legends, from

Again and again one gets the impression that western man was in the grip of overpowering forces. "The people of the United States have taken their tone from the incessant expansion which has not only been open but has even been forced upon them" (37, 4, 211).

Now what makes this determinism particularly questionable is the fact that it is materialistic, yet in a high degree confused and cloudy in its statement of causes. Turner has been attacked by the economic determinists for not regarding commercialism, industrialism, and capitalism as more important than the continent—and the frontier essays certainly pay far too little attention to the commercial character of nineteenth-century American society, East *or* West. This school of critics is also quite correct in labelling Turner a geographer and a sociologist rather than a champion of the Marxian dialectic or interpretation.[28] Nevertheless Turner remains, in his own way, almost as convinced a materialist as the author of *Das Kapital* himself. Only Turner's mastering force is a multiple thing, a cluster of causes singularly disparate and inharmonious. Part of the time the essays cite the natural environment, the physical continent, the wilderness; at other moments the source of change is located in the state of society: the sparseness, mobility, or indiscipline of settlement. Admittedly, America represented both physical hardship and social opportunity. The West was rough (a geographic factor) and it was empty (a sociological force). Perhaps, then, Turner's greatest achievement was his successful marriage of these two dissimilar forces in the single phrase: *free land*. He did not invent the term or the ideas it contains. But he most certainly popularized them.

---

which his hypothesis must itself have derived, have doubtless exercised their own share of influence, quite independently. Yet if today our leaders still hitch our star to a covered wagon, the frontier theory may share the responsibility.

[28] This accusation would seem one to be borne quite cheerfully. To the present writer, the substitution of *economic man* for *frontier man* would constitute a most doubtful improvement.

If this sounds like a defense of Turner, it is intended rather as a clearer definition of his special materialism, which remains objectionable. And it remains so—even disregarding the untenable variations in his definition of "frontier"—because too much is attributed both to the land and to the fact that it was easy to acquire. A number of Turner's ablest friends and admirers regard his "free land" doctrine as a contribution of extraordinary insight and importance, and unquestionably it does seem impressive. Yet the modern observer cannot but be disturbed by the failure of some non-English groups, and even of a tremendous number of native Americans, to heed this call. The open spaces do not seem to have acted as a solvent on the Pennsylvania Germans or the *habitants* of Lower Canada, and the migratory New England groups were only partially disintegrated, while an increasing number of farm boys gravitated to town and city (an even stronger solvent?) instead. It will bear repeating that Turner perhaps exaggerated the importance of "free land." [29]

On the other hand, I cannot but feel that too small a role is allowed to man's own character and ambitions, to his capacity for change, and to the traditions and momentum of the society which came to use this free land. Thus the continent masters, destroys, commands, and creates—while man is surprisingly passive. Where many of us are inclined to regard the physical environment as permissive, or limiting in its influence, Turner in his essays tends to make it mandatory. Vice versa, where sociologists are today coming to recognize

---

[29] Perhaps it is unreasonable to suggest that the North American Indians ought to have profited in the same fashion from so much free land. Yet what about the Spaniards, who had the run of the whole hemisphere? Did the Mississippi Valley make them democratic, prosperous, and numerous? In a word, do not the level of culture, and the "fitness" of a society for the wilderness, matter more than the wilderness? Employing again the comparative vista, were there no unoccupied forests in medieval France? And if today a new continent were to rise out of the Pacific Ocean, are we so sure that it would encourage small freeholds, not corporation or governmental monopolies? (For stimulus and clarification on this point I am indebted to the professors and students of history at the Johns Hopkins University.)

the factor of tradition and habit as very powerful, and where a man's ability to master circumstance is at times conceded to be extraordinary, the frontier hypothesis tends to ignore human origins and peculiarities, at least in the composition of American traits and American institutions. Thus first causes are made to lie in real estate, not state of mind. Hence, again, the first Colonial settlers are not examined with any care, but are treated as if they were *average* Europeans. And the later developments and changes in coastal society are handled as if they could have had only two sources: either a fresh migration or influence from Europe, or the powerful influence of an innovating frontier. Native invention in New England? Improvement in New York without the stimulus of the West? Apparently not.[30]

The Contradictions and Omissions

It remains to add two final comments. They concern contradiction and omission.

However optimistic, nationalistic, one-sided, repetitious, fatalistic, undocumented, or erroneous a number of Turner's proposals may appear, the curious fact seems to be that one of the most striking weaknesses of the essays as a whole is internal inconsistency. As has been hinted throughout this paper, the frontier theory in its full development does not hang together. The nationalism of the frontier does violence to its sectional tendencies, innovations are derived from repetition, the improvement of civilization is achieved *via* the abandonment of civilization, and materialism gives birth to idealism. Such inconsistencies do not necessarily condemn the whole theory out of hand. But they do unsettle convic-

[30] Turner did not write thirteen essays on the frontier without recognizing that the frontier area in which New Englanders settled turned out somehow different. Again he spoke of Germans in Wisconsin, of Scandinavian immigration, and the like. But by and large, it was the land these immigrants went to rather than the traits they came with, that seemed to Turner *significant*.

tion; they make it hard to remain complacent; they invite the most careful, open-minded restudy.

To this should be added the thought of what Turner did not write. Making all due allowances for the fact that the master's essays were composed in the period 1893–1920, it remains true that in the single field of economics he slighted the industrial revolution, he didn't seem to understand the commercial revolution, and he said nothing at all about the agricultural revolution. Yet it might be asserted that the last alone will be found to have produced more changes in American farming in the nineteenth century than all the frontiers put together! Again, it must be clear from our restatement that the frontier essays entirely failed to check the hypothesis by setting American experience against world experience. Because Turner was primarily a *Western* explorer, his pupils and followers have tended to neglect the all-important comparative approach. When, then, we review the questions with which this paper began, when we remember that the thirteen frontier essays treat the development of "American" and Middle-Western characteristics without reference to Romanticism, to Evangelism, to the eighteenth-century Enlightenment, to the scientific discoveries and the secularization of thought that in varying degrees have overtaken all Western peoples since the discovery of America, it may fairly be deduced that *for future purposes* these celebrated statements leave too much out.

Perhaps a conclusion may be stated in these terms:

In what it proposes, the frontier hypothesis needs painstaking revision. By what it fails to mention, the theory today disqualifies itself as an adequate guide to American development.

HARVARD'S COMMEMORATION DAY
JULY 21, 1865

HAMILTON VAUGHAN BAIL

ON July 25, 1865, the entire front page of the New York *Times*, as well as a third of the last page, consisted of a single news item. That fact in itself should cause most persons to pause and take at least passing notice of such an occurrence; when it is learned that this was evidently the only time in its history when that paper—or perhaps any other paper since the very early days of journalism—ever so devoted its entire front page, such passing notice might be increased to a real interest; and when it is found that that piece of news was the account of the commemoration exercises held four days previously by Harvard College for its Civil War heroes, even Harvard alumni themselves might not be entirely indifferent to the event.[1]

That Commemoration Day on July 21, 1865, has been called Harvard's greatest occasion—the greatest day the College ever saw—the result in part of the feeling of joy and relief, of thankfulness and rejoicing, with which the end of our Civil War was greeted. Harvard alumni had good reason for jubilation, tinged though it was with sadness, for the College's participation in that ordeal was a large one, and its record was unexcelled, in General Leonard Wood's opinion, by that of any equal number of men entering the war from any civil institution.[2] Without universal conscription or the numerous auxiliary units of our more recent wars, nearly 600 men out of the fewer than 2700 living graduates of all ages listed in the *Triennial Catalogue* of 1863 were in the armed

[1] Much of the material for this paper has been found in the contemporary newspapers of Boston and New York. Although in such cases the reporters' own words have been used almost invariably, it has been thought wise in many instances to omit continuing series of quotation marks.

[2] See his speech at the meeting of the Associated Harvard Clubs, New York, 1912, in the Proceedings of the meeting.

services, of whom ninety-nine gave their lives for the Union cause.

But this great day in Harvard history has taken on a larger significance, chiefly because of a long poem read toward the end of the crowded program. Not attentively heard by many in the restive audience and therefore not thoroughly appreciated on that day, it became, when printed some weeks later with the addition of its eloquent tribute to Lincoln, one of the recognized masterpieces of American literature. Through Lowell's famous Ode, the Harvard Commemoration of 1865 has in a sense become the property of the nation, and this fact perhaps justifies a retelling of its story, in another time of crisis even greater than that which had then just passed.

Hardly had the country finished reading about the surrender at Appomatox when a spontaneous movement arose among a group of alumni to honor the Harvard soldiers, living and dead. It may well have been Colonel Henry Lee of the Class of 1836 who originally conceived the celebration, for among his papers on the Commemoration in the College Archives is a memorandum entitled "First thoughts about Commemoration," which is in effect an agenda for a meeting called in accordance with the following notice, which first appeared in the Boston *Daily Advertiser* on May 8, 1865:

> The Graduates of Harvard College are invited to meet at Chickering's Concert Room on Friday, the 12th of May, at 12 o'clock, in order to take action for a public recognition of the services rendered the country by graduates and students of the College during the War of the Rebellion. The attendance of Class Secretaries is specially requested.

This meeting, a full account of which appeared in the *Advertiser* the following day, was called to order by Samuel Eliot of the Class of 1839. Colonel Lee's agenda was followed with scarcely a hitch, according to good old-fashioned ward caucus procedure. After a few appropriate remarks explaining the object of the meeting, the chairman proposed a long list

of officers, who were unanimously elected but whose functions were evidently ephemeral and for the most part honorary.

According to Colonel Lee's instructions the newly elected president, Charles G. Loring, then dilated upon the propriety of a Commemoration and the possibility of its being followed by a more permanent memorial; after this exordium the Reverend S. K. Lothrop made a few remarks and proposed that the chair appoint a nominating committee to select a list of sixteen gentlemen to constitute a committee of arrangements. In view of the fact that the nominating committee was composed by mere chance of gentlemen previously selected by the Colonel, it is not surprising that they in turn selected as the committee on arrangements those already on his agenda. These he had already divided into sub-committees of Finance, Invitations, Dinner and Procession, and Music and Services, of which Messrs. Amos A. Lawrence, Waldo Higginson, Henry Lee, Jr., and Francis J. Child were the respective chairmen. William Gray was chairman of the full committee.

It must be admitted that no less a person than Charles Eliot Norton seems to have thrown a wrench into Colonel Lee's plans at this point. The latter had intended and Dr. Lothrop's motion had stated that the Committee on Arrangements was to handle both the commemoration and the permanent memorial, but Professor Norton amended the original motion to provide that the committee already appointed handle only the commemoration and that an additional committee be chosen to consider the permanent memorial. His amendment was accepted. Emerson, Charles G. Loring, Samuel Eliot, and Charles Eliot Norton were among the members of the committee whose activities culminated in the erection of Memorial Hall.

On May 17 the committee announced its plans in the *Advertiser:* there would be a memorial service in the Unitarian Church in Cambridge on Thursday morning following Commencement Day (later changed to Friday because the Phi

Beta Kappa Society refused to give up its alleged rights to Thursday), with appropriate religious exercises, music, and an address. The recently constructed Appleton Chapel was not large enough and was too new. In the afternoon of the same day the reception of the returned soldiers would take place with music and speeches, and such refreshments as would be required would be furnished in the interval. Invitations were to be sent to the families of those who had fallen and to all surviving alumni who had served in the war. Two additional tickets were also to be sent to each man who had been in service. "To carry out these arrangements in a becoming manner a fund must be provided, in addition to that which will result from the disposal of tickets to the Alumni generally, who are the hosts of the occasion." The article contains a list of prominent alumni who had already subscribed $100 or $200 each; additional subscriptions were solicited from others.

In a letter to the Harvard Corporation dated May 27, William Gray on behalf of the Committee formally requested permission to use part of the college grounds and buildings for the celebration.

During the next two months notices about the event of one kind or another were continually appearing in the *Advertiser:* class secretaries were requested to send their addresses to John C. Ropes of the Committee on Invitations; announcement of the ceremonies began to appear on June 15, when graduates were told they could procure tickets for the dinner at $5.00 from Dr. Joseph Palmer at the counting-room of the *Advertiser;* alumni who had served during the War and who had not received an invitation for the ceremonies were invited to communicate with Professor Child; and at last the official program appeared with instructions to all concerned.

Chimes on Christ Church welcomed the auspicious day with peals of joy. The elements combined to render the occasion one of comfortable pleasure, and though exceedingly

warm, the fierce rays of the summer sun were tempered by a cool and refreshing breeze from the northwest. As a preliminary to the actual celebration, the Porcellian Club had a breakfast at nine o'clock for its members who had served in the army, of whom over twenty were present. A special guest was Major-General George G. Meade, who "after the gustatory performances was elected an honorary member of the Club, whereupon he signed the constitution, and is hereafter one of the Gods."[3]

As alumni assembled that morning they found the Yard—where breathed the odor of scholastic sanctity—decorated on all sides with flags, banners, and bunting. At the entrance a long line of flags was strung between Harvard and Massachusetts Halls. In its center was a white banner bearing in black an inscription from the ninth book of the Aeneid:

NULLA DIES UNQUAM MEMORI VOS
EXIMET AEVO[4]

On the reverse—taken from the ninth ode in the fourth book of Horace—was the inscription:

NON ILLE PRO CARIS AMICIS AUT PATRIA TIMIDUS PERIRE[5]

The front of Harvard Hall was decorated with a huge pyramid of bunting, with a United States shield in the center, while flags of different nations hung from the windows. Massachusetts across the way was festooned with bunting, a pyramid of red, white, and blue in the center containing a shield of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to face that of the United States. A fluttering mass of red, white, and blue was likewise festooned around three sides of University Hall, where there was also a large pyramid of bunting in the center, beneath which was a "glory of flags" and an American eagle

---

3 New York *Daily Tribune*, July 24, 1865.
4 There will never be a day when you will be lost to a mindful age.
5 He was not afraid to die for his friends or his country.

twelve feet in length. Flying from the eagle's beak was the welcoming inscription:

QUOD BONUM FAUSTUM FELIXQUE SIT
VOBIS REIQUE PUBLICAE
REDITE IN PATRIAM AD PENATES[6]

This was perhaps composed by Professor George M. Lane; the first words may be recognized as the expression regularly used for opening public meetings or extending greetings to any gathering, the initials alone standing at the head of Harvard Commencement programs.[7] It is perhaps of passing interest that in none of the Boston but in all of the New York papers reporting on the celebration were these Latin mottoes translated. The decorating was the work of Messrs. Lamprell & Marble "who are entitled to credit for the tastefulness of the designs and the general good appearance of the buildings." In the words of the New York *Daily Tribune*:

The college grounds presented the liveliest scene. Gentlemen of African descent were busily engaged in conveying from wagons to the pavilion mammoth baskets of good things and mysterious boxes, contents unknown. Men with bunting are stretching it hither and thither. Men without bunting look placidly on. "Goodies" were putting the finishing touches on the apartments of young gentlemen who are busily engaged in the concoction of punch, the artistic arrangement of pipes, tobacco and cigars, or bestowing upon their toilets the last fond glance by the aid of questionable mirrors. Reporters were rushing around in the most frantic manner, bothering their eyes and brains over ye old style Latin said to have been invented by Mr. Livy. Small boys were engaged in mimic battles upon the green. Side-shows abounded; lung testers, stereoscopic views, a war show—itinerant peddlars of bad cigars (where are the Internal

---

[6] May both you and the nation have peace and happiness. Return to your country and your home.

[7] Professor E. K. Rand kindly furnished the information about the source of these Latin inscriptions.

Revenue Inspectors?) and a hundred others, embracing the popcorn and peanut branches of trade, were all abundant.[8]

All this latter entertainment on the Common was simply the aftermath of the Commencement carnival of those days.

On this great morning there came together in the Yard

the largest gathering of the Alumni ever known in the annals of the College, all eager to do honor to those who have so nobly sustained the fame of the University and the honor of their country in the hour of peril. Here are men whom the world delights to honor present today to twine the wreaths of oratory and song around the brows of the surviving heroes, to sing dirges and pronounce eulogies upon the illustrious dead. Here are fair ladies who have assembled to crown with wreaths of smiles the chivalric knights who have done their devoirs for "Fair Harvard," and to tenderly express their emotions at the shrine of the departed heroes. Never was such a gathering to do honor to such an occasion.[9]

The alumni and undergraduates began to gather at Gore Hall—where Widener now stands—at ten o'clock; an hour later, under the guidance of a strong force of marshals in opera costume, they moved out in a column of twos toward the Unitarian Church, headed by Gillmore's splendidly uniformed band. The procession marched at a funeral pace, and the music it kept step by was a dirge, at once the mournfulest and the most exultant strain that Harvard's walls had ever echoed with.[10] A note in Colonel Lee's papers indicates that the music to be played during the march to the church was "Harvard Marching Along," but no information can now be found regarding any such piece. After the chief marshal and his aides came Governor Andrew of Massachusetts and President Hill of Harvard, each so totally different from the

[8] New York *Daily Tribune*, July 24, 1865.

[9] New York *Daily Tribune*, July 24, 1865.

[10] William Garrott Brown, "The Great Occasions of an American University," in *The Foe of Compromise and Other Essays* (New York, 1903), 197–200.

other physically that they could not keep step to the music; then followed the Governor's staff, the president and orator of the day, chaplains of the day, invited guests headed by General Meade, vice-presidents of the day, the Committee on Arrangements, the long line of those who had served in the war, and finally the remaining alumni and undergraduates.

> Men in privates' uniforms stepped proudly side by side with men adorned with major-generals' stars and buttons, showing that rank and military dignity were sunk for the day, in good class-fellowship. Stars, medals, gold lace, foul anchors, chevrons, hospital steward badges—the insignia of every grade of military and naval life, moved swiftly to the church.

And all the while "the Cambridge chimes and Gillmore's splendid music pleasantly agitated the air." [11]

Ladies had been instructed to be at the church at 9:30 o'clock and when the alumni arrived the galleries and side pews were already densely crowded with a brilliant array of beautiful and gaily dressed young women, interspersed with matrons in soberer hues. As the long line of heroes passed up the central aisle, the audience showered upon them repeated applause. Among those heroes he who seemed singled out for special acclaim was William F. Bartlett, of the Class of 1862, a major-general at twenty-five—perhaps the fittest representative of those whom the occasion was meant to honor—those who lay dead on Southern fields—because he had left both a leg and an arm behind him. Many were unable to get inside the church—Edward Everett Hale said that his class of 1839 was one of the last to enter the building. Anticipating this huge gathering, the committee had taken the precaution to obtain from the architect, William R. Ware, an opinion that the church was strong and safe enough for such use.

With Charles G. Loring presiding, the services began with

---

[11] New York *Herald*, July 23, 1865.

the singing of "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God," the verses written by Frederick H. Hedge of the Class of 1825 for Luther's hymn, to the music of a cantata by Johann Sebastian Bach. It was sung by a choir directed by John Knowles Paine, recently appointed Instructor in Music, supported by an orchestra of twenty-six pieces conducted by Carl Schultze. Hedge's words for this song were printed in full on the program. The Reverend Dr. Walker, ex-president of the College, then read selections from the Scriptures, after which the choir sang the opening movement, followed by the *Sanctus* of Cherubini's Requiem. A prayer eloquent in its simplicity and fervor was then offered by the Reverend Phillips Brooks, of the Class of 1855; and the congregation sang a hymn to the tune of "Old Hundred" written by Robert M. T. Lowell, '33, brother of James Russell, and author of "The Massachusetts Line" and other well-known war lyrics of the time. The Reverend Dr. George Putnam, speaking eloquently and poetically for half an hour or more, then delivered the address of the day—an address full of pathos and evidently inspired by deep and poignant personal experience, "which will be read with feeling and admiration so long as the records of the University shall endure." The exercises were concluded with the singing by the choir and a quartet, composed of the Misses Adams and Ryan and Messrs. Langmaid and F. H. Underwood, of a rich and stirring *Gloria in Excelsis* from a Mass written by Mr. Paine—a rare piece of excellence, though difficult of performance.

Special mention should be made of the prominence of the music at these morning exercises, under the charge of John Knowles Paine, who in 1862 had been appointed the first Instructor in Music at Harvard. For the services in the church he organized a choir of sixty voices, male and female, from students, graduates, members of the Harvard Musical Association, and other ladies and gentlemen of Cambridge and Boston. This choir was drilled to sing some of the finest music with the accompaniment of an orchestra of twenty-six

instruments. But it was done under most discouraging conditions: it was impossible to gather the same singers together at any two successive rehearsals; it was hard to collect the orchestra; there was only one opportunity for a full rehearsal of choir and orchestra together. But even so, they produced music such as was never known before at Harvard or any other college in the land![12]

But beautiful and impressive as was the music at these services, it was the matchless prayer of resignation and of triumph delivered by Phillips Brooks, then less than thirty years old, which was the "crowning grace of the Commemoration." As chairman of the committee in charge of the church services, Professor Child had asked Brooks to deliver this prayer. The latter so wrote his brother on May 29, adding, "I wrote accepting. It will be a great time, I expect." Although he was unknown to Boston and Harvard at the time, he had performed valiant service in his field during the war and was well known among the Harvard youth; Child had been particularly impressed with his work in Philadelphia in the cause of the freedmen.

Colonel Thomas Wentworth Higginson of the Class of 1841, later said that when he saw the name of Mr. Brooks on the program, he wondered why a young man of whom he had never heard should be so chosen. He put himself in a mood of endurance through what he anticipated as a dull formality. But with the first sentence from those burning lips, his attitude changed. He found himself listening breathlessly. He felt that he had never heard living prayer before—that here was a man talking straight into the face, into the heart of God. Said another listener:

> "That prayer! O that prayer!" These were the words I heard as I re-entered the college grounds. It was given by the Reverend Phillips Brooks, a graduate of Harvard, ten years previous, now an Episcopal clergyman of Philadelphia. As he stood in all the

[12] See Dwight's *Journal of Music*, August 5, 1865.

majestic beauty with which he is endowed by favoring nature, he stood, to mortal eye, confessed of hosts the leader and of princes the king.... One would rather have been able to pray that prayer than to lead an army or conduct a state.[13]

Dr. William R. Huntington of the Class of 1859 also wrote about it:

All the circumstances connected with the event have faded from my memory. All that I discern as I look into that holy blessed mirror is the image of Brooks, standing in his black gown in the pulpit of the old Harvard Square Church. ... his great head thrown back, his face looking as if it might be Stephen's, while there went forth from his lips a fiery stream of thanksgiving and supplication the like of which I never knew. I remember where I was sitting in the crowded north gallery, and I remember Brooks, and I remember my pride in him—these three, the place, the man, and the pride, are all I remember.

The Chief Marshal of the day himself said:

In the annals of our College there is a red-letter day, Commemoration Day; when, after years haggard with anxiety, the mother welcomed back the remnant of the children who had escaped "the pestilence that walketh in darkness, the destruction that wasteth at noonday."

On that day words seemed powerless; they did not vent the overflowing of sympathy and gratitude all felt.

But in the exercises came a prayer, a brief prayer of a few minutes, of one inspired to pour forth the thanksgivings of the assembled brethren.

From that moment the name of that inspired young man, till then unknown, became a household word.[14]

And finally Charles W. Eliot (who, however, was not among those present) said:

---

[13] The comments of Colonel Higginson, Dr. Huntington, Eliot, Sumner, and the unidentified "other listener" are all to be found in Alexander V. G. Allen's *Life and Letters of Phillips Brooks* (New York, 1900), 544 *et seq.*

[14] *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Second Series, Volume VIII (Boston, 1893), 80.

It was the most impressive utterance of a proud and happy day. Even Lowell's Commemoration Ode did not at the moment so touch the hearts of his hearers; that one spontaneous and ultimate expression of Brooks' noble spirit convinced all Harvard men that a young prophet had risen up in Israel.

What did Brooks himself say about it? In his diary he wrote: "Friday, July 21, 1865. Commemoration Day at Cambridge. I made a prayer at the services in the morning. P.M., banquet in a tent on the college grounds." Years later, however, he is known to have told a friend that what touched him most was Senator Charles Sumner's thanking him for it with tears in his eyes.

No record of that prayer remains.

As soon as the church services were completed, the ladies slowly and gracefully emerged from the galaxy gallery and were conducted to Harvard Hall, where a bounteous collation awaited them. This consisted of salmon and lobster salads, cold chicken, tongue, ice cream, cake, coffee, and tea (with sandwiches evidently added as an afterthought), all served by young girls. "As many of the lady guests will be mourners, it would be unseemly to invite them to the dinner, but they may desire to be present in a retired position to listen to words of respect and sympathy, and they certainly will need some refreshment and privacy." So wrote Colonel Lee in his preliminary report!

In the meantime the gentlemen devoted an hour or so to the interchange of congratulations and the imbibing of the contents of Harvard's "mystic punch bowls," which are ever full. Or, as another reporter wrote, "The students and heroes communed together about the yard and in the rooms a half hour until the scent of the Indian weed and the aroma of the punch began to permeate the classic shades and hilarious sounds proceeded from the sober old halls." [15]

---

[15] New York *Daily Tribune*, July 24, 1865.

About two o'clock the procession began to re-form in reverse order at Gore Hall. During the process members gave themselves up to unmixed jollity. All down the line the different classes were singing class, college, and patriotic songs, executing the "Boom, jing-jing" chorus, and "Mary Had a Little Lamb." The Auld Lang Syne "hand-around" was attempted by some of the classes, ending with a lively physical exertion in great rings. Old, grey-headed grads were young again for the nonce, and kept their pins with much more ease than some of their younger brethren who had been "smoking" in the dormitories.

The procession, in a column of twos, finally moved through the Yard to a pavilion which had been erected by Mr. Yale in the quadrangle between Harvard, Hollis, and Holden, under the shade of the old Class Day Elm. The line was divided into squads of forty files, each escorted by a marshal, and entered the pavilion two squads at a time, by two doors at the east and west ends of Holden. As they entered the pavilion the alumni found that some thirty tables, each holding a squad, had been set up around the quadrangle, with the head table for the celebrities on a dais in front of Holden, the marshals in front of Harvard, a special men's choir of thirty voices in front of Hollis, and Gillmore's band opposite them, next to the avenue. The tent was decorated from its apex to the sides with festoons of bunting and groups of flags. A Harvard banner was suspended in the center. On one of the supports back of the president's chair was the old flag of the Harvard Washington Corps with its inscription, "Tam Marti quam Mercurio." On the wall of Hollis was a great coat-of-arms of the College, enshrined in a glory of flags. On six tablets under the arms were inscribed the names of those Harvard men who had lost their lives in the service—ninety-three in all (with six more to be added to the record later).

The tables were boutnifully supplied with bouquets and loaded with confectionery and fruits. At each place was a pamphlet containing Harvard's roll of honor and a leaflet

with the words and music for three songs which were sung later in the day. These were "The Soldier's Oath," by the Reverend C. T. Brooks, 1832, sung to music written expressly for the occasion by John Knowles Paine; an Ode, also written for the celebration by John S. Dwight, 1832, sung to the simple and solemn music composed by F. F. Flemming for "Integer Vitae Scelerisque Purus"; and Oliver Wendell Holmes's "Union and Liberty" which he had written for the *Atlantic Monthly* of December, 1861.

The company—well over 1200 in number—was finally seated about three o'clock, and the chief guests filed in with the President of the Day and took their posts at the upper table. The appearance of General Meade caused great applause, to which he gracefully bowed his thanks.

A raised platform had been erected in front of Harvard Hall opposite the head table, to which a flight of steps led down from that building's center window. To this the five hundred ladies who had already finished their own collation in the Hall had been conducted by four assistant marshals. At the appropriate moment, when all were seated, a screen in front of this platform was lowered and they appeared to the view of the assembled multitude—bright and fresh and more beautiful than ever even after three days of strenuous activity. There they enjoyed the welcome given to their husbands, sons, brothers, and friends who had returned, and listened to the expression of affection and esteem for those who had fallen in the war—adding beauty and grace to the brilliant galaxy of heroes beneath the canvassed roof. But although they sat there gaping out at the men (as John Langdon Sibley said in his diary) the latter, totally absorbed in the not very romantic but certainly very satisfactory task of mastication, had no time to return the complimentary glances.

Grace was asked by the Reverend Dr. Joseph H. Allen of the Class of 1840, of Northborough. Then, amid the rustling of dresses and the sibilant language of the ladies, the dinner was consumed with all the appetite of the Army and the

classic taste of the University. It was not elaborately got up, however. It consisted merely of cold chicken, braised tongue, green geese, potted pigeons, lobster and salmon salads, cold à la mode beef, hams, etc. (What could the "etc." have comprised?), peas, tomatoes, and corn, pies, ice-cream, and fruit, ending with coffee and Angelita cigars, of which 4000 were consumed (at a price of $115 per M.)![16]

The elegant and substantial dinner was provided by Mr. J. B. Smith. A letter to the editor which appeared in the *Advertiser* of July 24, under the heading "A Deserved Compliment," read:

> I hope you will call attention to the faithful and admirable manner in which Mr. Smith, the caterer, prepared and served the immense dinner and collation of Friday at Harvard College. Other officials had comparatively an easy task; but to cater for such a multitude was a herculean labor which was thoroughly well executed.

No wines or liquors were supplied at the Committee's expense, but the chief marshal provided whiskey, brandy, hock, claret, champagne, and sherry, which the waiters served to those who would pay cash on the spot. But we read that "in view of the warmth of the day [the dinner] was much improved by the abundance of sparkling, foaming, ice-cold Weld farm cider, with which the tables were kept supplied."[17] Colonel Lee had written in his preliminary report: "Perhaps the old college beverage so strongly recommended by the venerable John Adams as a most wholesome tonic much used in his time—cider—might be furnished as part of the dinner." In this connection Amos Lawrence had written the Colonel a note reading:

---

[16] See Colonel Lee's papers on the celebration, in the Harvard Archives.

[17] Boston *Daily Evening Traveller*, July 22, 1865.

J. Forbush, Bolton, Mass. is the best cider maker in Worcester County. It sells now for $3.25 a doz. in boxes of 12 bottles each. Perhaps this is cheaper than Weld or Adams charge. Besides neither of them probably have enough. Their cider is sweeter but rather too much "fixed up" for old cider drinkers.

There was a charming contrast between this dinner and that on Commencement Day: wit, born in camp or college, flew from guest to guest, and from table to table; but a short hour sufficed the plain English bill of fare, and the flow of soul then commenced.

Honorable Charles W. Loring, as President of the Day, again presided, assisted by a corps of ten vice-presidents, and after Colonel Lee had called the assembly to order, delivered an eloquent and appropriate opening address, warmly applauded throughout. At its close the band played "Home Sweet Home." The boy-general, Major-General Barlow, of the Class of 1855, happening to enter at this moment, was greeted spontaneously with nine cheers, to which he briefly replied. Major-General Devens, of the Class of 1838, was then introduced as the first to march to the rescue of the country. His allusions to Governor Andrew and Generals Meade and Grant were rapturously applauded, and the entire speech was listened to with great satisfaction. After the choir had sung the "Soldier's Oath," Governor Andrew was introduced, the band playing "Hail to the Chief" and the gathering greeting him with three cheers given with Harvard good will. There was thunderous and prolonged applause when he had finished his highly eulogistic speech in praise of the deeds of Harvard's sons. The choir then sang the Ode which John S. Dwight had written especially for the day. President Thomas Hill, "the honored chief presiding over Harvard's destinies," was next introduced, and of course the band followed with "Fair Harvard." Major-General Meade, the victor of Gettysburg, who had been given an honorary degree only two days previously, was then called upon.

He was received with the utmost enthusiasm, the company rising and cheering lustily, while the ladies added their testimonial by the waving of dainty lawns and cambrics, and the sunshine of welcoming smiles. " 'What a patrician look the General has,' I overheard several enthusiastic Beacon Streeters remark. 'He appreciates and enjoys this as Grant or Sherman never could.' " So wrote the New York *Herald* reporter. When the tumult had somewhat subsided, Colonel Lee called for three cheers for Mrs. Meade. Following the General's remarks the band played "Hail Columbia," and then Samuel Eliot read some stanzas entitled "Return" which Julia Ward Howe had written for the celebration.

With a few well-chosen words Mr. Loring then introduced Ralph Waldo Emerson, who was sitting with his class of 1821. It was eminently fitting that Emerson should speak on this day. As Lowell said, "To him more than to all other causes together did the young martyrs of our civil war owe the sustaining strength of thoughtful heroism that is so touching in every record of their lives." An entry under the general date of July in Emerson's Journal indicates that he probably had been working on his short speech before the day arrived. We there find two of the thoughts which he incorporated in his remarks: "*Our young soldiers.* Those dedicated men! who knew on what duty they went and whose fathers and mothers said, 'We gave him up when he enlisted.' We see the dawn of a new era, worth to the world the lives of all this generation of American men, if they had been demanded." His short address was "full of the richness of thought and the poetry and the imagery which are so peculiarly Emersonian," as the New York *Tribune* reporter wrote, who also called it in his summary one of the few things worthy of the day. Emerson's power as a speaker was unmatched. Again it was Lowell who said, "I have heard some great speakers and some accomplished orators, but never any that so moved and persuaded men as he." At the time of Emerson's death E. R. Hoar wrote that there were two things which should be par-

ticularly recorded about him, one of which was "his power as an orator, rare and peculiar, and in its way unequalled among our contemporaries."

Emerson's remarks were first printed in the Boston *Daily Advertiser* the following day; they later appeared in the New York *Times* on July 25 and perhaps elsewhere. They were not published until the collected edition of his works appeared in 1884. They are there found in the volume *Miscellanies,* with the title, "Harvard Commemoration Speech, July 21, 1865."

"What would a Harvard celebration be without Dr. Holmes? And so, after the band had played 'America,' the Doctor was called up, and read one of his soul-stirring lyrics celebrating the return of peace." These stanzas of Holmes's were also first printed in the *Advertiser* of July 22 and later in the New York *Evening Post,* the *Times,* and the *World.* They are also found in Littell's *Living Age* of August 26. They were collected in *Songs of Many Seasons,* published in 1875, under the title, "For the Commemoration Services (Cambridge, July 21, 1865)." Dr. Holmes's poem was frequently and heartily applauded, and manifestly gave great pleasure to the eager listeners. At its conclusion the choir appropriately sang the Doctor's "Union and Liberty," set to the music of the "Russian Hymn."

Then followed remarks by Rear-Admiral Charles H. Davis, of the Class of 1825, as the representative of the Navy, with the band playing "The Star Spangled Banner"; remarks by Major-General Manning F. Force, '45, of Ohio, with the band playing "Yankee Doodle"; and then some words by the Reverend Dr. Joseph P. Thompson, of New York, as the representative of Yale. "Who better than Yale could lay a wreath on the bier of Harvard's dead, and congratulate her on the return of her sons?" he asked.

President Loring here introduced that oft-wounded and maimed hero, General William F. Bartlett, '62, by referring to an early French portrait of a young cavalier on horseback,

one eye covered with a handkerchief, a hook for his sword-hand, and a wooden leg in one stirrup with a legend ending, *"Et Mars ne lui laissa rien d'entier que le coeur."* Bartlett said a few words with great diffidence and, hesitating, was interrupted by Colonel Lee with the remark, "As the speaker of the House of Burgesses of Virginia said to Washington, 'Sit down, sir, your modesty is equal to your valor, and that surpasses the power of any language I possess.' " This simple happening has been called the most impressive of the whole afternoon.[18]

James Russell Lowell was next called upon to read the ode which Professor Child had asked him to write for the celebration—"a graceful poem, which was received with the most decided demonstrations of satisfaction," "of which it is the highest praise to say it was worthy of its distinguished author!"

The President then introduced as his last speaker the Reverend James K. Hosmer, of the Class of 1855, the famous "Corporal Hosmer of the Color Guard," who spoke as the representative of the rank and file. Hosmer was the author of *The Color Guard* and *The Thinking Bayonet,* which have been called the best books written about personal life in the army.

Finally, at seven o'clock, after Colonel Lee had proposed a health to the alumni absent on duty, whose names he read to the gathering; and after the company had joined hands and sung the usual spirited "Auld Lang Syne" until the older men were forced to stop; and after cheers for President Hill, Mr. Loring, Colonel Lee, and others, the greatest celebration ever known at Harvard since the founding of the University came to an end.

In due course Colonel Lee filed his financial report, indicating a total outlay of $7941, of which $4810 was spent for

---

[18] See Francis W. Palfrey, *Memoir of William Francis Bartlett* (Boston, 1878), 158.

refreshments and $666 for music. Expenses were met by $2510 from the sale of tickets and private donations of $5431.

One of the immediate criticisms of the arrangements was voiced very shortly by three distinguished professors in the Law School. In a letter to the President and Fellows, Joel Parker, Royall Professor; Theophilus Parsons, Dane Professor; and Emory Washburn, Bussey Professor, called attention to the fact that none of the names of members of the professional schools *per se* was borne on the roll of honor; none was invited to participate in the exercises; and none was even at liberty to unite in the ceremonies unless there was room after all others. They requested the Corporation to make sure that full justice was done to the Law School in the final Roll of Honor; and they particularly wished arrangements to be made so that no such similar omission should thereafter occur at Commencement or other occasions. This is of interest as being probably the first time a voice was raised on a subject that even to this day brings forth divergent opinion.[19]

Measures had been taken for the press to have complete reports of the day. The Boston *Daily Advertiser* (the *Alumni Bulletin* of its day) and the New York *Times* published minute stories with all the details and speeches and poems—except for the two most important utterances of the occasion. No paper contained the words of that moving prayer by Phillips Brooks, and no paper contained the Ode read by James Russell Lowell—all that is now remembered of the day. Lowell did not hand a copy of his poem to the press because he had evidently already planned the private publication of fifty copies. Other newspapers—both those in Boston, and those of New York, as well as elsewhere—were much more brief. The New York reporters invariably turned in more interesting stories; not being members of the mutual admiration society, they wrote more objectively.

After this detailed factual recital of the events of the day,

[19] The letter is in the Harvard Archives, Corporation Papers, 1865.

let us see what the general consensus about the celebration was. Let the New York *Daily Tribune* speak first:

> To sum up: The commemoration was elaborately arranged by a competent committee, backed by the wealth of Harvard. No endeavors on their part have been wanting to make the affair a brilliant success. The students were brim full of enthusiasm and anticipated a glorious occasion, and yet the affair, regarded as a whole, was tame and unworthy of Harvard. The speeches were unsuited to the occasion, were dull, heavy, long, and characterized by too much sameness. It wanted but a few ringing sentences to bring out the pent-up spirits of those assembled, but they were not spoken. It needed an electric thrill to touch the right chord, but it was lacking. It required the soul and heart of the speaker to reach the souls and hearts of the auditory, but the speeches were more from the head than the heart.
>
> With the exception of Mr. Emerson's brief remarks, which were not heard by all, and Dr. Holmes's lyric, there was scarcely anything worthy of the fame of Harvard. Disappointment was generally expressed by all, and if the perpetual form of commemoration is as tame and unsuitable as that of today, it might be made of glass and erected at the North Pole.

Although the reporter acknowledged the courtesies he had received, perhaps these had not extended to bottled cider.

Here is what one of the five hundred ladies—Mrs. William Wetmore Story—wrote to her daughter about the occasion:[20]

> . . . But the day of days at Harvard was that of "Commemoration," . . . when all the world of mutual admiration, with many an outsider, were convened to talk over the War, its heroes and victories, deciding, as it seemed to me, that the State of Massachusetts had fought all the battles and raised all the money and troops. I never heard such a crowing as there was, and though I quite agree that Massachusetts *has* distinguished herself beyond the rest and come out of the struggle with the fairest record, yet

[20] Henry James, *William Wetmore Story and His Friends* (Boston, 1903), 174.

I can admit some virtue in the sister States, some laurels for other sons than those of Harvard. It was a charming scene and full of interest to us. I wish you could have been with us, and as Emerson's well-remembered tones fell upon my ear I found it hard to be comforted for your absence. I should so much have liked you to hear my old favorite. There too James Lowell read a very fine poem, full of spirit and pathos. I met so many old friends and acquaintances that I was entirely beleagured by the cloud of old associations that they recalled.

Mrs. James T. Fields wrote in her diary the following day:

What an ever-memorable day, the one at Harvard! The prayer of Phillips Brooks, the Ode of Lowell, the address of Dr. Putnam and the Governor, and the heartfelt verses of Holmes, and the lovely music and hymns. But Lowell's Ode!! How it overtops the whole of what is preserved on paper besides! Charles G. Loring presided. "Awkwardly enough done," said O. W. H.; "It is a delicate thing to introduce a poet, he should be delivered to the table as a falconer delivers the falcon into the air, but Mr. Loring puts you down hard on the table—ca-chunk." [21]

Most commentators agreed with Dr. Edward W. Emerson, of the Class of 1866, who remarked in *The Early Years of the Saturday Club*: "This affectionate occasion—a day of pride and sympathy, mourning and rejoicing—cannot be forgotten by any one who was there, while memory remains."

Finally let us quote in part an editorial which appeared the next day in the *Transcript*:

It was indeed fitting that the venerable University should mark the glorious fact in its history and the history of the times, by special services; celebrate by proud and tearful eulogy, by banquet and song and eloquence, the introduction into its honorable annals of its brightest and noblest page. The heavens smiled upon the great occasion; and the occasion itself supplied the high

21 M. A. DeWolfe Howe, *Memories of a Hostess: A Chronicle of Eminent Friendship Drawn Chiefly from the Diaries of Mrs. James T. Fields* (Boston, 1922), 36 n.

thought and the tender and lofty emotion needed to consecrate it.

The public exercises were fitting. The arrangements for them liberal and appropriate. But perhaps the chief interest was behind these and mingling with them—an interest beyond the reach of the reporter's skill. The grasping of warm hands, telling of warm hearts; the reunion, in expressions of respect and loving friendship, among those who had escaped the deadly bullet, and the generous words spoken of classmates who had fallen, and the manly tears shed to their cherished memories;—these, together with the justifiable pride and affectionate greeting with which kindred, friends, and the older Alumni greeted the youth, who, in holding up and defending the national banner, put laurels and diamonds on the brow of Alma Mater, such as she, with all her crowded honors, all the richness of her jewelry, had never worn before;—these must be left to the imagination and remembrance that entered into the meaning of the Golden Day—none the less golden because its brilliancy was veiled and softened by the transparent shadowing of gentle sorrow.

Here ends the story of that Commemoration Day celebration of July 21, 1865; but before the pen is laid down let one of the participants in the struggle which it commemorated—and probably one of the participants in the events of that day—explain the underlying reasons behind both that celebration and the subsequent erection of Memorial Hall. It was Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, of the Class of 1861, speaking at Commencement in 1884 on "Harvard College in the War," who said:

What, then, did the College do to justify our speaking of the war now? She sent a few gentlemen into the field, who died there becomingly. I know of nothing more. The great forces which insured the North success would have been at work even if those men had been absent.... And yet—and yet I think we all feel that to us at least the war would seem less beautiful and inspiring if those few gentlemen had not died as they did. Look at yonder portrait [of Robert Gould Shaw] and yonder bust [of Charles Russell Lowell] and tell me if stories such as they commemorate

do not add glory to the bare fact that the strongest legions prevailed. . . . And the warrant of Harvard College for writing the names of its dead graduates upon its tablets is not in the mathematics, the chemistry, the political economy, which it taught them, but that in ways not to be discovered, by traditions not to be written down, it helped men of lofty natures to make good their faculties. I hope and I believe that, long after we and our tears for the dead have been forgotten, this monument to their memory [Memorial Hall] still will give such help to generations to whom it is only a symbol,—a symbol of man's destiny and power for duty, but a symbol also of that something more by which duty is swallowed up in generosity, that something more which led men like Shaw to toss life and hope like a flower before the feet of their country and their cause.

MEMNONIA: THE LAUNCHING OF A UTOPIA

BERTHA-MONICA STEARNS

IN the early summer of 1856, three New England reformers in the Middle West found themselves embroiled in controversy over their conflicting ideals. Horace Mann, president of the newly opened Antioch College, at Yellow Springs, Ohio, felt that the purity of his experiment in liberalized education was threatened because Thomas Low Nichols, a stormy petrel of reform, openly branded as a "free-lover" by the sensational press of the time, was about to take up his residence in the neighborhood. Nichols and his lawfully wedded wife, Mary Gove Nichols, proposed, with such congenial spirits as might care to join them, to establish in the peaceful college town a "Memnonia Institute" or "School of Life," devoted to the bringing about of a "Harmonic Society on Earth." To this end he had leased what he described as "the spacious and beautifully situated Water-Cure at Yellow Springs,"[1] and here he offered a home, a school, vegetable diet, hydropathic treatments, and the regimented life of a self-sustaining association to men and women who desired freedom from the despotism of society. The announcement of such an enterprise headed by radical reformers who proclaimed themselves socialists of the school of Fourier, spiritualists, and believers in the sovereignty of the individual aroused Antioch to action. The academic community promptly declared war against the undesirable intruders, and led by the president of the young college, advanced to battle. Feeling deeply his responsibility for the Antioch experiment in coeducation, President Mann regarded with horror the prospect of having near his campus a "School of Life" headed by a man and woman whose writings on the subject of marriage had made them notorious. He denounced the project root and

1 *Nichols' Monthly*, March, 1856. For an account of this couple, see the writer's "Two Forgotten New England Reformers," in the *New England Quarterly* for March, 1933 (VI, 59–84).

branch, refused to countenance it, and excitedly labeled the whole scheme "a superfoetation of diabolism upon polygamy." [2]

The feeling against the newcomers was, without doubt, natural enough. For several years their names had been linked with the expression "free-love," and they had come under the general opprobrium meted out to reformers who insisted upon discussing the relation of the sexes. Until the year 1850 Thomas Nichols and Mrs. Mary Gove, whom he married in 1848, had written on various topics, lectured on health and dietary reforms, and contributed regularly to a widely known periodical, the *Water-Cure Journal and Herald of Reform.* None of these activities had brought them any particular social disapproval, although they were regarded as belonging to a suspiciously advanced group in New York. During the decade from 1850 to 1860, however, their zeal for improving the human race took more radical forms. They continued to maintain that health was the first condition of happiness on earth, but they further insisted that until many worldly institutions were reformed, human beings had no chance of living in a healthful relation to one another.

Nichols had had considerable journalistic experience, wrote well, and did not hesitate to use his pen in advancing the social doctrines he accepted. In 1849 he published a book called *Woman in All Ages and Nations,* his first contribution to that "Science of Society" which was to engage his energies for the next ten years. This work, as its name implies, was for the most part a simple history of the condition of woman from the earliest times. But in the concluding chapter, "Promise of the Future," the author declared his belief that through the system of Association proposed by Fourier, humanity was about to be brought into harmony with the Universe. When the hoped-for reorganization of society was completed, every woman would be "the free owner of herself," no longer com-

---

2 Moncure D. Conway, *The Dial,* May, 1860, page 526.

pelled by economic conditions or social necessity to "languish in the chains of indissoluble marriage," but able to choose the life most congenial to her nature in an earth "radiant with beauty and salubrious with purity."[3]

To his Fourieristic socialism, Nichols, like many other reformers of the day, added a belief in the Harmonial Philosophy of Andrew Jackson Davis, and after the "rappings" following the exhibitions of the Fox sisters in 1848, he found in the idea of a freer spirit-intercourse on earth a creed that helped to unify his varied enthusiasms. About the same time he became a whole-hearted convert to the doctrine of "Individual Sovereignty" preached by Stephen Pearl Andrews. This doctrine Nichols defined as "the most absolute freedom, with its simple rightful limitation—freedom to do anything of which I can bear the cost; which will inflict injurious consequences upon no other being."[4] The critics who took the Individual Sovereigns seriously and abused them in the newspapers of the day usually failed to note the "rightful limitation" attached to their demand for freedom, and described them vigorously as enemies of society, intent upon a life of license. During the early years of the eighteen-fifties, Fourierists, Spiritualists, and Individual Sovereigns alike were accused of advocating "free-love," and in many of the discussions of marriage that agitated the public, Mr. and Mrs. Nichols took a lively part.

In 1852 Dr. M. Edgeworth Lazarus published a volume entitled *Love vs. Marriage*, setting forth the theory that "civil marriage makes personal property of woman, and in a less degree of man also." Andrews rushed into print in defense of the book, engaged in a newspaper discussion with Horace Greeley and Henry James on the subject of marriage, and soon afterwards published a pamphlet in which he boldly demanded the Principles of Human Liberty in the Realm

---

[3] T. L. Nichols, *Woman in All Ages and Nations* (New York, 1849), 228.
[4] T. L. Nichols, *Marriage* (Cincinnati, 1854), 460.

of the Affections.[5] Nichols welcomed these works and soon followed them with two books of his own—*Esoteric Anthropology* (1853) and *Marriage* (1854). In addition to associating himself with this debate, he joined Josiah Warren and Stephen Pearl Andrews in their attempt to establish on Long Island an Equity Village named Modern Times. Here, according to its founders, persons who hungered and thirsted for harmony in this world might be filled; according to its enemies, it was a place in which monsters of iniquity planned to live lives of sin.

Throughout the ferment of these discussions, Nichols was particularly vulnerable because, in 1851, he had assumed the role of teacher as well as that of writer and public speaker. He and Mrs. Nichols had opened a Hydropathic Institute, first in New York City, and later in the neighboring village of Port Chester, in which they offered instruction to young women in the laws of health, the methods of water-cure, and the art of living harmoniously. This undertaking was particularly dear to their hearts. "We consider ourselves educators—set apart for the work," Mrs. Nichols wrote.[6] As soon as the Utopian plans for Modern Times were well under way, Nichols decided to remove the school to that new settlement. His always fertile imagination conceived a grandiose scheme of a "School of Life" to be called the Institute of Desarrollo, and to this he began devoting his attention.

While waiting to begin this new venture he found himself under unpleasant attack. His connection with Modern Times and the Individual Sovereigns brought forward the charge that the Hydropathic Institute was a center from which "free-love luminaries sent forth their rays." This accusation was definitely voiced in a letter to the *New York Tribune*, signed "Villager," purporting to come from a citizen of Port Chester.[7] According to the writer of the letter, the Hydropathic

[5] See *Love, Marriage, and Divorce, and the Sovereignty of the Individual*, edited by Stephen Pearl Andrews (New York, 1853).

[6] *Water-Cure Journal*, July, 1852. [7] New York *Tribune*, July 21, 1853.

Institute had been deserted by the entire student body, and was being advertised for sale by its proprietor, Thomas Low Nichols. The reason for this, "Villager" declared that he could explain: The young ladies of the school had for some time been "plied with communications in which the doctrines respecting woman and her sex functions, duties and privileges, as inculcated in Nichols' physiological treatise *Esoteric Anthropology* and Mr. Andrews's pamphlet on *Love, Marriage, and Divorce* were insisted upon and given a personal direction." These "communications" also dwelt on the idea of Individual Sovereignty, so dear to the teachers in the school. "Whether the practical application of the doctrines was sought among the pupils," the writer was unable to say, but he had "reason to believe it was." One young lady, he had learned, feeling that the Institute was not a proper home for her, fled hastily. The others, greatly alarmed, decamped in a group. "What else was to be anticipated," the letter concluded, "as a result of the practical application of such filthy doctrines as inculcated by Nichols and Andrews?"

Nichols' reply, also printed in the *Tribune*,[8] was prompt and vigorous. "Villager" had brought the charge that teachers in the Institute had betrayed the confidence of their charges, and that the school had broken up in consequence. "Neither charge is true," Nichols asserted.

> I have advertised Prospect Hill for sale because I have a domain of one hundred acres on Long Island on which I have commenced the erection of an edifice to accommodate two hundred persons. . . . Mrs. Nichols and myself have never betrayed in any manner the parental trust reposed in us. The circumstance upon which this gossip was based—the only event that ever marred the harmony of the school—grew out of the revengeful malice of a passionate girl whose imprudent conduct had called for censure and to whose natural protectors I had given friendly warning. She poisoned the minds of five young ladies

[8] July 22, 1853.

who improperly left the establishment without notice during my temporary absence. To the public I wish to say:—For my opinions, read my published works; for my conduct as a husband, parent, teacher, physician, and man of business ask those who know me. I court investigation. I have violated no trust and there lives not a man or woman who can truly charge me with immoral conduct. Any assertion of lack of propriety is false, and if made by a responsible person, I will bring it before a Court of Justice for legal investigation.

Nothing further seems to have been said of this matter, and in a few weeks Nichols moved to Modern Times.

At the same time that Doctor and Mrs. Nichols were conducting their Hydropathic Institute (1851–1853), they were also busy editing a periodical of their own, *Nichols' Journal of Health, Water-Cure, and Human Progress.*[9] In this they hoped to carry on their broader work for humanity by advocating changes in the whole organization of society. Their project of an institution combining a school and a home which, in 1853, they were dreaming of establishing on their "domain" at Modern Times, was elaborately described in the pages of the *Journal.*[10] This Institute of Desarrollo was to exemplify their "views of a true Life and a true Education in Health, Science, Industry, and Art." It was to be a School of Life in which men, women, and children were not only to prepare to live, but to live. In handsome buildings, which included printing offices, book-bindery, model kitchen, bakery, laundry, gymnasium, picture gallery, and winter garden in addition to the lecture rooms, dormitories, and parlors for social life, noble spirits longing for a higher life were to learn and to labor together in perfect freedom and harmony. The only things lacking to make this dream a reality, apparently,

---

[9] No file of this publication is recorded in the Union List of Serials, but a contemporary periodical, *The Huntress,* May 21, 1853, states that it was begun in April, 1853.

[10] Quoted in the Appendix to Nichols' volume entitled *Marriage* (Cincinnati, 1854), 427 ff., as from *Nichols' Journal,* October, 1853.

were money, buildings, and harmonized spirits to accept the Eden offered them. Two years later, Nichols wrote:

> This effort to organize Integral Education on the basis of Health, Industry, Freedom and Harmony, proved to be premature. The public was not ready . . . even to tolerate such an experiment, nor had the demand for it come to the point of practical realization with the most advanced reformers.[11]

The repeated attacks upon Modern Times and the agitation against its founders soon convinced both Thomas and Mary Nichols that a work of preparation needed to be done before the idea of a Harmonic Home anywhere could take form. New York not having proved a fertile field for their efforts, they decided to change the scene of their labors to Ohio. Cincinnati seemed to offer possibilities, since the harmonial philosophy of Andrew Jackson Davis was acceptable to many persons there and spiritualism was being widely discussed. Moreover, Josiah Warren had already labored in the region and had established an Equity Village called Utopia, only thirty miles away. The soil might well have been prepared by earlier workers. Accordingly, the Nicholses established themselves in that city, renamed their periodical *Nichols' Monthly, a Magazine of Social Science, and Progressive Literature,* and in its columns proceeded to agitate for a "Progressive Union" of congenial natures.

The specific aim of the Progressive Union as set forth in *Nichols' Monthly*[12] was the formation of Harmonic Homes in different sections of the country. In these Homes, individuals who had become physically harmonized through health, and spiritually harmonized through accepting the direction of "supernal intelligences," were to live together free from "all ownership, bondage, restraint, or burthen." The mission of each group was to show mankind the possi-

11 Appendix, 437.

12 Partial file of *Nichols' Monthly*, volumes II and III, in the University of Illinois Library.

bility of a harmonic society on earth, in which no one ate flesh, poisoned the atmosphere with tobacco, held property in a wife or husband, or pursued wealth or personal ambition. The organization of daily life in such a community was apparently to be very similar to that which Nichols had outlined for his Institute of Desarrollo, but it was conceded that any given group would be smaller than the one hoped for in Modern Times.

To popularize their doctrines and provide readers with literary entertainment both Mr. and Mrs. Nichols contributed to the *Monthly* fictitious narratives, published serially, in which their "advanced views on Social Science" were reinforced. Mrs. Nichols, in an autobiographical novel called *Mary Lyndon,* recorded the adventures of a heroine who demanded the right to live her own life in her own way. This work, published in book form in the summer of 1855, received severe treatment at the hands both of the New York *Tribune* and the New York *Times.* It was pronounced a sensational apology for free-love, in spite of the fact that the story ended in what one reviewer called "the mild rosy twilight of a happy marriage." The book doubtless gave offense because of the frankness with which Mrs. Nichols used her own experience as the material for her novel. Mary Lyndon, obviously Mrs. Nichols herself, was represented as suffering public reproach because, after an unhappy marriage, she separated from her legal husband, formed new friendships from which she received great happiness, and finally, after a divorce, accepted the heart and hand of a "conjugal partner" whose interests in social regeneration she shared.

The reviewer for the *Tribune*[13] found the writer singularly destitute of reserve and fanatical in converting her own sufferings as a martyr into enthusiasm as a missionary for greater freedom of women. Yet he admitted that earnest feeling animated the book and often aroused the sympathy of the

[13] August 4, 1855.

reader. This mildly unfavorable review was followed in the *Times*[14] by four columns of abuse, headed "A Bad Book Gibbeted." The reviewer pronounced the novel a disgusting addition to a class of works intended to attack the institution of marriage, and had nothing but scorn for the author. After this attack the publishers of the work, who had advertised it elaborately as "an American *Jane Eyre*," ceased to push it, and book and author were mentioned only to be derided.

Thomas Nichols, in a long and turgid romance entitled *Esperanza*,[15] painted a picture of life as it might be lived in a completely Utopian Harmonic Home such as the "Progressive Union" dreamed of establishing on earth. The tale bore as little relation to reality as did the magnificent plans for the Institute of Desarrollo. A traveler from New York was represented as visiting the perfect land of Esperanza, where human beings free from all selfishness and every form of competition dwelt in loving association and emulated the lofty conduct of a Spirit World. Directed by a noble leader, easily to be identified as Nichols himself, the harmonized beings of the Land of Hope made all time holy. They listened to lectures, learned to labor for the joy of serving one other, created beauty by their music, art, building, and costumes, ate grains and fruits, bathed often, conversed interminably, owned themselves, and in every way proved the inferiority of what the world called civilization. However, since the harmonized beings of Esperanza were represented as sharing the responsibility for offspring with more than one of the opposite sex, the narrative could not be expected to recommend its author as a desirable citizen of a new community.

Such had been the efforts of the newcomers to Yellow Springs when, in March, 1856, they announced their intention of again acting as teachers or leaders in a School of Life,

---

[14] August 17, 1855.

[15] Part of this novel appeared in *Nichols' Monthly*. Later, other chapters were added, and the whole was published in book form as *Esperanza* (Cincinnati, 1860).

this time to be called Memnonia. The Hydropathic Institute of New York, the School of Desarrollo, and the dream of a Harmonic Home all doubtless contributed to the idea of Memnonia. The opportunity to take over a Water-Cure establishment in a country village, to summon to their side other believers in Individual Sovereignty who might enjoy a simple life, and to edit their journal in a quiet spot seems to have aroused anew the ambition of these seekers for a better world. But harmony was not yet to be their portion. Their writings and their associations rendered them suspect in the vicinity of Antioch. The new college feared their contaminating influence.

A Prospectus printed on the covers of *Nichols' Monthly*, gave notice that the editors of the periodical had leased land for their project, and proposed to give at Memnonia "thorough courses of lectures on such subjects as are either not taught in the schools at all, or taught superficially and imperfectly." Among the subjects were to be elocution, music, drawing, painting, sculpture, composition, and whatever else might be deemed necessary to enable the residents to live beautiful lives. Although the property selected for the new Community was, the founders declared, large enough to accommodate about one hundred persons, they expected to begin their work with only a small "germinal group" or "vital center." This group, they hoped, would soon prove to be "so strong, so united, so harmonious," that hundreds and thousands would "cluster around it and be absorbed into the unity of its life." [16] April first was selected as the date on which the group should take possession, and Nichols, in his usual lavish manner, sent out an invitation to the public to be present at a formal opening, and to attend a celebration, a week later, of the anniversary of Charles Fourier's birth. Before these plans could be carried out, however, the embattled forces of Antioch and Yellow Springs had taken action

[16] *Nichols' Monthly*, March, 1856.

to prevent the introduction of a Harmonic Home into their midst.

Nichols' Monthly explained the necessity of withdrawing the invitation as follows:

> When the Circular of Memnonia was printed, we sent an early copy, with a polite note, to President Mann of Antioch College, expressing the pleasure we felt at the prospect of living in the vicinity of that liberal Institution. This feeling, we regret to state, was not reciprocal.... A public meeting was called, in which our opinions were denounced, and a committee—consisting of the Honorable Horace Mann and two citizens of Yellow Springs—was appointed to come to Cincinnati and make an effort to prevent us from entering upon possession of our leased property.... Memnonia may be delayed, but only for a brief season.[17]

Nichols announced that Cincinnati would continue to be his post office address for some time, since there was no probability that he could immediately gain possession of his establishment at Yellow Springs. "We have a lease, as good as a deed," he wrote:

> The proprietor wishes to have it occupied, and to receive his rent; but he has not been able to get possession himself, and has even been subjected to mob violence and a sham prosecution for making the attempt.... He is deprived of all use of his property, valued at over $20,000, and we of our rights, and our friends and patients of their hopes. Is there no law in Ohio? you ask. Personal influence and fanaticism over-ride law here as elsewhere. A single man, strong enough to control the people around him, has done all this mischief and wrong. The Honorable Horace Mann, backed by the faculty of Antioch College and a few interested citizens, has defeated the laws of the state, and made mob law or border ruffianism, triumphant. He threatened that

---

17 *Nichols' Monthly*, April, 1856.

if we were allowed to come to Yellow Springs he would resign and leave.[18]

This action of Mann's, Nichols buoyantly asserted, brought upon the College some of the very evils it apprehended. The excitement produced a discussion of principles; the newspapers spread the report of a "Free-Love Institution" at Antioch College; and more was done to advertise Memnonia in a month than its founders could have done in a year had they not been interfered with. "The fire being kindled," Nichols boasted,

> President Mann has been trying to put it out. One student was expelled . . . for selling our books. Others have been threatened with expulsion for the same reason. . . . A female student, brave enough to express her convictions of our honesty and purity, was assailed with slanderous accusations, which, on investigation, were found to be groundless.[19]

The June number of *Nichols' Monthly* carried on the history of the quarrel. Memnonia was still in the realm of things to be. Hopeful seekers for peace and health upon its acres had been obliged to return to their homes, and all applications for membership were being, of necessity, refused. "If any sick fail of cure for want of our treatment," wrote Nichols,

> it is Horace Mann who has hindered them. If any die who might have come to us and lived, he is their murderer. . . . It was his threat of resignation which alarmed the people of Yellow Springs, who think that he made Antioch, that Antioch has made or will make them, and that both will be destroyed if he resign.

In lieu of Memnonia, Nichols could only offer to the readers of his *Monthly* romantic chapters describing the land of Esperanza, where an Order of Industry labored happily for

---

[18] *Nichols' Monthly*, May, 1856.
[19] *Nichols' Monthly*, May, 1856.

the common good; an Order of Recreation enjoyed regattas on a lake, rehearsals for drama and opera, or discussions on the Unity of Nature; and where all alike enjoyed health-giving meals of corn, potatoes, green peas, boiled rice, and fruits while they listened to music and talked of literary and artistic matters.

By July the local excitement over Memnonia and its much talked-of founders had subsided, and a small group of what proved to be insufficiently harmonized spirits took over the property in Yellow Springs, as they had planned to do in April. A wider acceptance of spiritualism had something to do with allaying the prejudice against the reformers. A well-known medium of the day, J. B. Conklin, lectured in the region during the summer and converted many persons to a belief in spiritualism. His personal friendship for Dr. and Mrs. Nichols convinced the respectable folk of whom he made converts that the Harmonic Society planned by these reformers might not be dangerous after all.[20] President Mann persisted in thinking it objectionable, but when the newcomers opened their doors in mid-summer, there was no manifestation of ill-will toward them. "On the contrary," Nichols declared, "we have been treated with uniform respect and kindness . . . with the single exception of the Honorable Horace Mann, who has recently manifested violent feelings toward us."[21]

A circular announcing the opening of Memnonia Institute was at once issued, and applications were solicited from all who might be interested in joining the new community. Persons who wished to associate themselves with the life of the Home were asked to consider carefully the Canons of Consecration printed in *Nichols' Monthly,* in accordance with which they were to pledge themselves to be pure in spirit, pure in person (daily baths and clean attire), pure in diet (no animal food except dairy products), and to observe

[20] *Nichols' Monthly,* July, 1856.
[21] *Nichols' Monthly,* August, 1856.

a partial fast on Fridays and Sundays.[22] In order to insure a true harmonic life at the beginning of the experiment, Memnonia was to be "provisionally a despotism." Just how this form of government was to avoid conflicting with the principles of Individual Sovereignty, Nichols did not explain, but he acknowledged that there was censure of this ruling by those who lacked understanding.[23]

During the autumn the "germinal group" that assembled at Memnonia seem to have worked together in reasonable harmony. A few patients came for the water-cure treatments, some students registered for short periods of instruction, and a number of "interested and intelligent inquirers after truth" attended the Sunday afternoon meetings. The regular members of the community carried on the necessary labor of house and farm, pursuing in their leisure hours the study of music, languages, and the "all important questions affecting human progress." There was no "routine of education," but instruction was provided for those who desired it, and "circles" met for discussions on Friday and Sunday evenings and every morning at half past seven o'clock.[24]

As the weeks went on, life at Memnonia became increasingly ascetic, instead of justifying the fears of President Mann. So austere was the code of conduct imposed by those in authority that few persons could live up to the lofty requirements. Daily confession was required and severe penances were meted out to offenders. Friction resulted. Human jealousies and financial loss added to the difficulty of maintaining a harmoniously unified group. At length, early in the year 1857, the struggling community ceased to exist. Weary of trying to create a new order in a chaotic world, the leading spirits of Memnonia turned for solace to the Church of Rome

---

22 *Nichols' Monthly*, September, 1856.

23 *Nichols' Monthly*, August, 1856.

24 *Nichols' Monthly*, September, 1856, an article called "Our Life at Memnonia."

and surrendered their questioning to its authority. Nichols and his wife were made members of the Catholic faith at Saint Xavier's church in Cincinnati, on March 30, 1857.[25]

On April 25, the editor of the *New England Spiritualist* (a periodical in which Nichols had earlier expressed his views on free thought, free speech, and free love) printed a communication from the former head of Memnonia. Nicholas wrote:

> We have been socialists of the school of Fourier, and have earnestly labored for the establishment of a unitary or harmonious society. Our studies and efforts brought the conviction that such social regeneration is possible only in a holy life. It has pleased God to bring us to accept his Holy Church. In that Church we see the order, the devotion, the consecration, the faith and obedience necessary for the great work of human redemption. Believing in and submitting to the Church, we look to the accomplishment of its divine mission . . . I have found already unexpressible peace.[26]

Early in the following year, Moncure Conway, then pastor of the First Congregational Church in Cincinnati, visited Yellow Springs. There, at the one little inn the village afforded, he met another guest whom he describes in his *Autobiography* as "a beautiful woman, of rare intellectual power." She was the only remaining member of the Memnonia Community, and from her Conway learned all he could about the short-lived settlement.[27] This information, gained at first hand, he later embodied in a review of *Esperanza* which appeared in the Cincinnati *Dial*, for May, 1860. He wrote:

> Memnona,[28] when in its most flourishing condition, numbered about twenty inmates. They were generally Eastern and English

[25] *New England Spiritualist*, April 25, 1857.
[26] *New England Spiritualist*, April 25, 1857.
[27] Moncure D. Conway, *Autobiography*, I, 261 (New York, 1904).
[28] Conway gives the name of the Community as Memnona. *Nichols' Monthly* always spells the name Memnonia.

people, and, we have been credibly informed, were persons who had met with disappointments and grief in the life of the affections.... It was represented to the country chiefly through the terrible denunciations of Horace Mann.... This community, however, had reason to know that Mr. Mann was mistaken; and that so far from Memnona being a seat of sexual license, it inaugurated in its actual life the asceticism and celibacy which afterwards carried its leading characters into the Church of Rome.... And when through pecuniary embarrassments—for the community ruined everyone who made any investment in it—and the jealousies of human nature, this false thing burst like a bubble, the eight leading persons immediately went into the Romish Church.

This dispassionate account with its few additional facts may fairly stand as a final comment on the menace to the purity of a region offered by Memnonia and its founders.

HAWTHORNE AND DOSTOEVSKI AS EXPLORERS OF THE HUMAN CONSCIENCE

VLADIMIR ASTROV

THERE are so many points of contact in the moral and psychological ideas of Nathaniel Hawthorne and Feodor M. Dostoevski that it is astonishing that they have not attracted more attention and study. Both were pathbreakers of the psychological novel; both were the greatest explorers of the human conscience in the literature of the nineteenth century; both were concerned with similar and very specific problems—reason enough, one would think, to provoke an inquiry as to their possible common grounds and to a possible connection between them. They were all but contemporaries (Hawthorne 1804–1864, Dostoevski 1821–1881), and different though their cultural background was, it had not a few essential spiritual features in common. Both, moreover, went through similar inner developments that cut them loose from their initial religious moorings; and both remained, to use a phrase of Dostoevski, "Children of their time, children of doubt." Both were impressed with certain trends of the German romantic idealism and with French socialist conceptions. The Heavenly Father had given place to a vague worship of the Universe or to faith in the accomplished society of the future. But Hawthorne as well as Dostoevski knew too much of the human soul and its needs not to recognize that a purely humanist millenium could never satisfy man's deepest desire. In a time that more and more inclined to believe in pure reason and material progress—that was interfused with the theory that man is good and only his institutions are bad—Hawthorne and Dostoevski pleaded for the rights of the spiritual, and stressed the power of the irrational and the abysmal in soul and life. Possibly this was due in part to the fact that both knew, and not only theoretically, the impact of the subconscious and even the pathological.

Hawthorne died in 1864, when Dostoevski's main psychological novels were not yet written. But could not Dostoevski have known his works? That this question has never even been raised seems due to a strange misconception in regard to the acquaintance of the Russians with Hawthorne and his work. Since even so renowned a historian of Russian literature as Abraham Yarmolinsky flatly asserts that interest in Hawthorne in Russia arose only of late,[1] there is little wonder that American authors shared this view.[2] Yet as a matter of fact, Hawthorne was very early one of the most eagerly translated foreign authors in Russian. During the decade between 1852 and 1861 almost all his greater and many of his smaller novels and tales appeared in Russian in outstanding magazines, which in those days were a main source of literary education for the Russian intelligentsia. Thus the *Sovremennik* brought out *The House of the Seven Gables* in 1852; "The Snow Image," "The Birthmark," and "Rappacini's Daughter" in 1853; and *The Scarlet Letter* in 1856. The *Biblioteka dla Chtenia* translated "Peter Goldthwaite's Treasure" in 1857. *The Marble Faun* appeared in the *Russkoe Slovo* in 1861. *The Wonder-book,* particularly popular with the Russian public, was reprinted in Russian at least five times. On several occasions Russian magazines published more or less elaborate but mostly highly appreciative articles on Hawthorne.

This being so, it is difficult to assume that so signal an author could have escaped the attention of a writer and reader so vitally interested in literature as Dostoevski. It is true that from 1849 to 1854 he was pent up in the "dead house" of Siberian penal servitude, cut off from all litera-

---

1 "Hawthorne has been rather slow in gaining ground in Russia. Only of late years has he attracted some attention (and now his complete works are being published by a Petrograd firm)." Abraham Yarmolinsky, "The Russian View of American Literature," in *The Bookman* (September, 1916), 47.

2 For instance, W. L. Phelps, in *Some Makers of American Literature,* 109: "In the twentieth century *The Scarlet Letter* was carefully translated into Russian."

ture. From 1854 on, however, he was again free to read and to write, especially after 1859, when he was permitted to return to St. Petersburg and to rededicate his life to literature.

Again, it is true that the name of Hawthorne seems never to occur in Dostoevski's writings or letters. But neither did he mention Edgar Allan Poe; and were it not for his anonymous article in the *Vremia*, 1861, one hardly would have guessed how deeply impressed Dostoevski was by the great American poet.[3]

The inference seems, therefore, plausible enough that F. M. Dostoevski did read the main novels of Hawthorne and was acquainted with his problems so forcibly presented.

This assumption, if true, would have the merit of shedding new light upon one particularly interesting moment in Dostoevski's spiritual and literary biography. We know that during his agonizing sojourn in Siberia, he underwent a deep religious metamorphosis. He arrived at the conviction that man's soul could not endure a life deprived of higher meaning and purpose. Life without faith in God and immortality must result in disaster, both individual and social. He deemed religious needs so vital that he was ready to pay the price should their fulfillment entail the sacrifice of the recalcitrant intellect. Life he deemed more important than logic.

But these new experiences took rather a long time to crystallize into definite insights and images. Dostoevski's biographers have sometimes wondered why his writings remained so long, as it were, ideologically vague and neutral. Only in the *Notes from Underground* (1863), and especially in *Crime and Punishment* (1866), did his new religious and moral attitude come into full shape. Then, as it happened, Dostoevski's main ideas showed such a remarkable kinship with the problems and solutions of *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Marble Faun* that the assumption of his acquaintance with Hawthorne appears natural and well-nigh inescapable. The

[3] See Vladimir Astrov, "Dostoievsky on Edgar Allan Poe," in *American Literature*, XIV (March, 1942), 70–74.

meeting with Hawthorne's ideas seems to have deeply fertilized Dostoevski's moral consciousness and his psychological imagination.

The following brief confrontation does not pretend, of course, to make good the hypothesis of a closer connection between the great American and the great Russian novelist. But it might prove of service for a further elaborate investigation.

I. HAWTHORNE

We Need "Physicians of the Soul"

Hawthorne and Dostoevski lived in a time of deep spiritual and social change. The whole structure of the inherited civilization was visibly cracking. Man was becoming aware how neglected and dismal was the life in which he had hitherto acquiesced. His first reaction was to tear down the old mansion from top to bottom. Yet soon enough he had to admit that it was easier to destroy than to build anew. Revolutionary enthusiasm and boundless dreaming was not enough. Instead of general welfare and happiness, Capitalism conjured up new forms of enslavement. Democracy freed the masses, yet too often manacled the best. Something was wrong—not alone without but within. The very foundations of life seemed crumbling. More and more the eyes of the most sensitive again turned inward.

From his own experience, Hawthorne knew how merciless the grip of the past could be. His mind lived long enough in a house haunted by ghosts, prejudices, and taboos. But when he left the past for the Unitarians, Transcendentalists, and reformers, at times he became doubtful whether the mosses and cobwebs of the old manse were not preferable to the arid emptiness of the new buildings and the glittering castles in the air. The lesson he learned at Brook Farm was that "A man's soul may be buried and perish under a dung-heap

or in a furrow of the field, just as well as under a pile of money." . . . "The real Me was never an associate of the community." [4] Could life prosper if the real "Me" was repugnant to it? What Hawthorne was in search of was a way of life where the real "Me" could unfold freely its potentialities and yield its wondrous fruits. This he missed in the present as well as in the past. It was this unquenched thirst that gave him the air of skepticism, and it was this yearning that made him a psychologist. While the amazing march of science disclosed new worlds and marvels, he saw religion and morals lagging helplessly behind. He saw reformers endeavoring to cure the human body, to establish new institutions, while the soul remained neglected and parched. Man's most urgent need, he saw, was "physicians of the soul." [5] Psychology became the vital task of mankind.

It has been disparagingly remarked that Hawthorne's Note Books were devoid of "either philosophical ideas or human interests." [6] Nothing is more unjust. It is true that what Hawthorne was primarily concerned with was not metaphysical constructions or economic remedies, but realities of the soul, spiritual facts. His appetite for psychological data was insatiable. He hunted for them as an entomologist hunts for rare insects, or rather—for he was less scientist than artist—as a painter seeks forms, hues, expressions. "His mind was bathed in a kind of *chiaroscuro*. . . . He had a painter's delight in tone." [7] He observed and impressed upon his mind any human situation, psychological entanglement, or spiritual development he could grasp. His Notes are filled with them.

---

[4] Newton Arvin, editor, *The Heart of Hawthorne's Journals* (1929), 74 and 77.

[5] *The Scarlet Letter*, Wayside Edition, v, 167; *cf. The Heart of Hawthorne's Journals*, 90: "A physician for the cure of moral diseases."

[6] Ludwig Lewisohn, *The Story of American Literature* (New York, 1937), 180: "Thus the late Professor V. L. Parrington, analyzing the 'Note Books' of Hawthorne, remarked, as every observer must, upon their emptiness of either philosophic ideas or human interests."

[7] Van Wyck Brooks, *The Flowering of New England* (New York, 1936), 216.

His mind was not scientific enough to deduce general laws from his loose observations. He used these as material for his literary imagination, often magnifying single traits into whole figures and psychological dramas. Yet he hunted for human facts not for the sake of reproduction alone. He gathered them in order to solve certain problems. Most of all, he was absorbed in the study of moral attitudes, of the experiences of the human conscience, of sin and guilt and their fatal implications.

It has often been asked why Hawthorne's interest was so persistently centered upon the phenomena of sin and guilt, as though human conscience were not teeming with other quandaries and riddles no less essential. It is Hawthorne's Puritan heritage which serves mostly as explanation of such exclusiveness. Yet Dostoevski shows a similar trend, and the theory which suggests Dostoevski's epilepsy as the source of this idiosyncrasy is hardly satisfactory. Moral oversensitiveness and guilt-consciousness is also the main subject of Hawthorne's other contemporary, the great German novelist Otto Ludwig—especially of his masterly novel *Between Heaven and Earth*. The part of guilt and sin in the ancient tragedy need hardly be elaborated.

The real cause seems to lie beyond mere subjective proclivities. The new scientific psychology of moral consciousness[8] has made it abundantly clear why human conscience has hitherto been so often actually reduced to feelings of sin and guilt. Guilt is awareness of an unfulfilled moral obligation, and obligation is a moral commandment linked with the prospect of reward in the case of obedience and of punishment, material or spiritual, in that of contumacy. Now most moral teachings were presented as commandments of superior powers which exacted unswerving obedience and threatened disloyalty with severest and even eternal punish-

[8] I refer specifically to Rudolf Maria Holzapfel's exhaustive investigations in *Panideal, Das Seelenleben und seine soziale Neugestaltung* (Jena, 1923).

ment. At the same time, these moral obligations were mostly formulated in such radical, sweeping, and unconditional terms that their strict and literal observance manifestly exceeded the natural power of man. The moral lawgivers indulged in such "all or nothing" prescriptions as "You shall not kill!" "Love everybody without discrimination!" "Don't harm anybody!" or "Flee the world and renounce the flesh!" They treated men as if they were children unable to graduate their behavior, to adjust themselves to the variety and mutability of real conditions. Life, however, compelled man to discriminate and to measure. Since this was morally unlawful, it had to be done surreptitiously, by way of compromise and of concession. The result was, inevitably, perpetual moral conflicts, remorse, feelings of sin and guilt. The morally blunt, the cynical who did not care for duties, throve, of course; the loyal, virtuous, and the consistent reaped the consciousness of moral insufficiency and despair. That is why sin and guilt actually became the most frequent and signal manifestations of conscience. In dealing with them, the great novelists dealt with the whole throng of moral quandaries.

Hawthorne's Basic Generalization

Moralists seem not only to have had little trust in the discriminating ability of the human race, but to have acted as if "good" and "evil," "virtue" and "vice" were inherent and immutable qualities of human motives and actions. As the young Emerson has set it forth:

> There is one distinction amid these fading phenomena—one decided distinction which is real and eternal and which will survive nature—I mean the distinction of Right and Wrong. Your opinions upon all other topics, and your feelings with regard to this world, in childhood, youth, and age, perpetually change. Your perceptions of right and wrong never change.[9]

[9] *Journals of R. W. Emerson* (Boston, 1909), I, 209.

Hawthorne, however, was struck by the dynamic nature and the multifariousness of all human attitudes, good and evil alike. He saw how variable and even how contradictory could be the inner springs and the effects of "good" and "evil." Where most moralists saw two solid arrays opposing one another, he discerned changing shades, gradations, interfusions, and transmutations. "Evil" suddenly developed into a wholesome condition of life; "sin" did not always prove to be the gangrene which moralists supposed it to be. The Guardian Angel and the Tempter seemed not seldom to interchange their functions.

Medieval schoolmen, it is true, had already raised the question whether God's Power was so infinite that He could, if He so desired, have ordered "vice" to be "virtue" and vice versa. Yet what seemed once a dialectical subtlety, Hawthorne saw, life imposed daily as reality. Was killing, for instance, not an evil in itself? And yet how many a time has mankind exacted, even praised and sanctified it? Certain mystics have extolled the Fall because it made Redemption possible. And could Christ have saved the world, had Judas remained loyal and virtuous?

Hawthorne was not a revolutionist. He was far from adopting the standpoint of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* that declared vice as a pre-condition of human progress. But it was their absolutism and rigidity which Hawthorne recognized as the sorriest spot on the moral ideals of the past and the most fatal impasse of modern life. Such was the main conclusion of his psychological observations, the decisive lesson of *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Marble Faun.*

"Ah, Hilda," replied Kenyon, "you do not know, for you could never learn it from your own heart, which is all purity and rectitude, what a mixture of good there may be in evil things; and how the greatest criminal, if you look at his conduct from his own point of view, or from any side-point, may seem not so unquestionably guilty, after all. So with Miriam, so with Donatello.

They are perhaps partners in what we must call awful guilt; and yet, I will own to you,—when I think of the original cause, the motives, the feelings, the sudden concurrence of circumstances thrusting them onward, the urgency of the moment, and the sublime unselfishness on either part,—I know not well how to distinguish it from much that the world calls heroism. Might we not render some such verdict as this?—'Worthy of Death, but not unworthy of Love!' "

"Never!" answered Hilda, looking at the matter through the crystal medium of her own integrity. "This thing, as regards its causes, is all a mystery to me, and must remain so. But there is, I believe, only one right and one wrong; and I do not understand, and may God keep me from understanding, how two things so totally unlike can be mistaken for one another; nor how two mortal foes, as Right and Wrong surely are, can work together in the same deed. This is my faith; and I should be led astray, if you could persuade me to give it up."

"Alas for the poor human nature, then!" said Kenyon, sadly, and yet half smiling at Hilda's unworldly and impracticable theory. "I always felt you, my dear, a terribly severe judge, and have been perplexed to conceive how such a tender sympathy could coexist with the remorselessness of a steel blade. You need no mercy, and therefore know not to show any."

"That sounds like a bitter gibe," said Hilda, with the tears springing into her eyes. "But I cannot help it. It does not alter my perception of the truth. If there be any such dreadful mixture of good and evil as you affirm—and which appears to me almost more shocking than pure evil,—then the good is turned to poison, not the evil to wholesomeness." [10]

Puritan rigorists had always to protect their integrity and their peace with blinds of inflexible dogmas from the impact of reality. This was the ostrich way to remain "pure" and consistent. The security thus achieved was, of course, an illusory one. Has the unconditional imperative not to kill prevented Christendom from bloodshed and warfare? It has only confused and wearied the conscientious. Has the maxim

[10] *The Marble Faun*, Wayside Edition (Boston, 1900), VI, 436–438.

of brotherhood and equality averted the rise of economic prerogatives, of social or racial discrimination? It has merely encumbered the ascent of the one truly fruitful differentiation—the consideration of *spiritual* variety and spiritual graduality.

However, so long as the ruling moral ideals remained undiscriminating and absolute, the conscientious had to conform whatever the cost. Moral cynicism or Machiavellianism of any sort was hardly less fatal. It is the old dilemma: "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

The question, of course, is: *Must* the human conscience remain so forever? Are moral ideals indiscriminate and rigid by nature? Hawthorne did not proceed in his inquiry so far as explicitly to ask this question. First of all, the old prejudices had to be shaken. This was the task *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Marble Faun* were engaged in.[11]

Hester Prynne's Consecrated Sin

Hester Prynne, in *The Scarlet Letter*, committed a crime, one of the greatest sins a woman could commit in a Puritan community. She broke a sacred law. Whose law? God's? God plays rather a subdued part in her moral drama. The world's

---

11 One wonders how an author like Louis Bromfield could say of Hawthorne: "A thousand years from now, a reader will find in his work not the slightest trace of the terribly real and concrete problems of the world." John Macy's *American Writers on American Literature* (New York, 1931), 98.

A different question is to what extent Hawthorne owed his psychological and moral viewpoint to impulses received from Emerson. In his aphoristic way, never afraid of consummate self-contradiction, Emerson had formulated analogous ideas. Thus we read in "Self-Reliance," "Good and evil are but names very readily transferable to that or this; the only right is what is after my Constitution, the only wrong what is against it." He planned to discuss in a new book the topic "That good motives are at the bottom of (many) bad actions." It should not be overlooked, however, that Emerson's *coincidentia oppositorum* and his sweeping overstrain of partial truths is by no means identical with Hawthorne's emphasis on the multiformity and the interblending of psychological and moral situations.

law? "The world's law was no law for her mind." The law of her own conscience? The most remarkable thing about Hester is the unbroken independence, even superiority, with which this stigmatized adulteress meets the cruel punishment inflicted upon her. She wears the token of her shame, the scarlet letter, almost as the first Christians accepted the cross—the mark of ignominy—and turned it into a badge of the chosen.

Whence did Hester draw her inner strength that enabled her to endure unmarred the doom of isolating outlawry, and even to mitigate the fanatical scorn of her Puritan persecutors? She drew it from the recesses of her conscience. She was cognizant of having transgressed an age-honored law, but her innermost self, the mysterious *alter ego* in her breast, did not condemn her. Her conscience remained clear. She had not betrayed Dimmesdale, the accomplice of her guilt and the cause of her ill fate, not only because she loved him too self-forgetfully, but also because she did not believe either him or herself deserving of damnation. To her mind their "legally" forbidden relationship had a "consecration of their own." Dimmesdale was not her husband before men, but he was so before her conscience. Her legal husband had no rights because she never had vowed her love to him. It was almost as if a new moral law, changed concepts of right and wrong, had obtained sway over her mind. She felt herself not degraded, because she seemed to belong to some other culture—"unchristianized," or no more Christian. This metamorphosis enhanced her soul, evolving all its most sublime powers, transforming the outlawed sinner into a being of the highest moral accomplishment.

Unlike Hester, her Puritan lover proved "not bold and not true"; not bold enough to defy the world's outworn law, not true enough to his and her new moral consecration. He was not loyal either to his old conscience or to Hester's new faith. And the old conscience laid its deadly hand upon his soul.

But even in the case of Dimmesdale, according to Hawthorne, sin and guilt proved not wholly devoid of positive consequences:

> His intellectual gifts, his moral perceptions, his power of experiencing and communicating emotion, were kept in a state of preternatural activity by the prick and anguish of his daily life. . . . [His] very burden it was that gave him sympathies so intimate with the sinful brotherhood of mankind, so that his heart vibrated in unison with theirs, and received their pain into itself, and sent its own throb of pain through a thousand other hearts. . . .[12]

Life is deeper and richer than the moralists assumed; sin is baleful only if it transgresses against one's own conscience; but human conscience is not static; it is neither the voice of an immutable God nor that of an unerring instinct—this is the lesson Hester's drama teaches. Yet what, indeed, is conscience? Which are the laws and the trends of its transformations?

The "Wilderness of Good and Evil"

It was a typical Puritan theory that "Alone the good will is moral." [13] Man has to do his duty and let Providence take care of the rest. Here Hawthorne's doubt set in. The Puritans who tortured the "gentle boy," who persecuted dissenters, witches, and sinners were perfectly "righteous" people. Righteous was Hollingsworth, who for the sake of humanity was ready to abuse his fellow men. Righteous were the priests who nailed Jesus upon the cross, the Inquisitors, who burned Giordano Bruno, Calvin who burned Servet; and so was also Robespierre.

---

12 *The Scarlet Letter*, Wayside Edition, v. 172 and 173.

13 *Cf.* Emanuel Kant: "Nothing can possibly be conceived in the world, or even out of it, which can be called good without qualification, except a Good Will." *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Ethics*, Thomas K. Abbott, translator (New York, 1932), 12.

Could, then, love claim to be an unerring cue in the labyrinths of human life? It was Hester's love that prevented the unfortunate Dimmesdale from public avowal of his sin, and thus let him become a prey to destructive remorse and to the revenge of her former husband. Donatello's self-neglectful love for Miriam compelled him to commit murder.

But puzzling as the incentives of human deeds are, still more paradoxical are their consequences. Sin may have wholesome effects; it may become a blessing, while flawless morality may entail moral standstill and decay. Such is the keynote of *The Marble Faun.*

Donatello symbolizes the human soul in a state of pure Nature; Hilda, the soul in a state of grace and pure morality. Donatello is indissolubly one with Nature and her creatures. He is complete in himself, but his capacities do not transgress the compass of sensual impulses; spiritual aspiration are intrinsically foreign to him. He has no moral ideas, and he needs no morality, because, like Nature herself, he is irrational and candid, hence he is beyond evil and good. His guide is not conscience but instinct and intuition. He is harmonious and happy, but only so long as his oneness with Nature is unimpaired. As soon as he leaves his Eden and mingles with the world, he is lost. Being without moral guidance and even incapable of it, he fails to find his way in the wilderness of good and evil which are inseparable from human life. Nature not knowing sin or guilt, he could entrust himself thoughtlessly to her ways. Now his passion for Miriam, irrational and overwhelming, like all natural impulses, becomes his undoing. He is so immersed in her being, so entirely one with her, that her anxieties and desires are to him as irresistible as commands of Nature. Thus he becomes almost unwittingly the arm that performs her dark and unuttered will, and murders her sinister pursuer.

But since his crime was not actuated by any higher reason or moral consecration, sin overpowers him. Guilt crushes

him; he can neither assimilate nor bear it. The very pith of his being is infected, corroded, and withered away.

And now, the unexpected happens. Remorse and despair have stirred up springs and forces in his soul he never before knew. Sin and guilt humanize, spiritualize, transform him:

"He perpetrated a great crime; and his remorse, gnawing into his soul, has awakened it, developing a thousand high capabilities, moral and intellectual, which we never should have dreamed of asking for, within the scanty compass of the Donatello whom we knew."

"I know not whether this is so," said Hilda. "But what then?"

"Here comes my perplexity," continued Kenyon. "Sin has educated Donatello, and elevated him. Is sin, then,—which we deem such a dreadful blackness in the universe,—is it, like sorrow, merely an element of human education, through which we struggle to a higher and purer state than we could otherwise have attained? Did Adam fall, that we might ultimately rise to a far loftier paradise than this?"

"Oh, hush!" cried Hilda, shrinking from him with an expression of horror. "... This is terrible; and I could weep for you, if you indeed believe it. Do not you perceive what a mockery your creed makes, not only of all religious sentiments, but of moral law? ..." [14]

Thus the "pagan" Paradise and the primeval harmony of Donatello proved irretrievably lost. But what about the Christian ideal? Christianity, the religion of the pure spirit, seeks not ceaseless struggle, but triumph over sin, and final peace; not aimless progression, but perfection. Is Christian perfection possible? Is it desirable? In the image of Hilda Hawthorne answers this question, and his answer is no less heretical than his exculpation of sin.

Hilda is the perfect Christian soul, sinless, serene, and uncompromisingly moral. She is beyond evil and guilt. But being beyond evil, she proves also to be beyond good. Un-

[14] *The Marble Faun*, Wayside Edition, VI, 519–520.

touched by sin, she is unmoved by it. Impervious to guilt, she is inaccessible to compassion; not needing mercy, she is unable to show it. She is virtuous up to the verge of heartlessness. She nearly resembles one of those blissful spirits in Heaven who are capable of enjoying their paradisiacal felicity within the sight of tormented sinners.

What is more, being not "of this world," she proves also unfit for this world. Free from any experience of evil, she is unprotected from evil. Only so long as she keeps away from reality, soaring in the dove-tower of her flawless ideality, is she able to preserve her inner peace and integrity. The involuntary witnessing of crime suffices to drag her helplessly down and to break her wings. And here too, as with Donatello, the enforced touch of sin has a rather humanizing and liberating effect. It makes her capable of experiencing real attachment and self-forgetful love.

But if ascetic spirituality leads to the same dead end as pagan naturalism, whither, then, could mankind progress? Of what shall consist that "higher, brighter, and profounder happiness" which, according to Hawthorne, man is to attain by means of sin, "after a long pathway of toil and sorrow"? [15] Many readers of *The Marble Faun* (especially of the first edition) were shocked by the abrupt interruption of the outer and inner story of Hilda and Donatello. This deadlock was not accidental. Hawthorne recognized the necessity of a quite different, far more complete and realistic ideal. But that goal remained dim, and the road to it undiscernible. Yet never was a task so vital and urgent as this one.

II. DOSTOEVSKI

"Crime and Punishment"

Like *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Marble Faun,* Dostoevski's *Crime and Punishment* is the story of the conscience of mod-

[15] *The Marble Faun,* 491.

ern man hopelessly entangled in the "mesh of good and evil," right and wrong. Once blindly relied upon, praised as the last spark of Divine Wisdom saved after the Fall, conscience today is bewildered, divided in itself, struggling against itself. "Let alone, conscience may arrive at the most monstrous conclusions," said Dostoevski. Indeed, the crime committed by Raskolnikov sprang not from selfish greed or ignoble passion, but from motives always held by conscience in high esteem.

The gist of *Crime and Punishment* is the revolt against the established moral powers. Raskolnikov refused to submit to conceptions which in his judgment entailed senseless waste of many of the highest human possibilities, often enough resulting in preferment and protection of the worthless and even baleful in human life.

An exceedingly gifted young student, Raskolnikov believed himself destined for accomplishments that promised to be of consequence and service to mankind. Utter poverty, however, doomed him not only to humiliating privations but to spiritual decay. He could continue his studies only at the price of unbearable sacrifices on the part of his old mother and his sister. Only one way seemed open to him to get rid of the misery which menaced his highest aspirations, but that way was neither moral nor lawful. There was an old woman-usurer, a decrepit, parasitic creature, whose means—immorally though legally gained—could easily solve his difficulties, and so be turned into a blessing for many. Had he not the right, had he not the moral duty, to correct the manifestly insensate and immoral distribution of wealth brought about by Providence? The old moral consciousness answered decidedly, "No!" It insisted upon the sacredness of any human life, however useless or harmful, upon the sinfulness of self-assertion and aggression.

At the same time he saw his sister Dunia, a strong and noble soul, full of love and eager for self-sacrifice, determined to

marry a man whom she detested and feared, in the hope thus to secure the future of her struggling brother.

And there was Sonechka Marmeladova, the prostitute with the gentle and saintly soul, who sold her body because this was the only way open to her to save her drunkard father and his helpless family from misery and despair.

Must one abide by moral commandments that imposed such sacrifices, irrational and degrading?

> It's clear enough. For herself, for her comfort, even for her life, she would not sell herself; but for someone else she would. . . . Oh, in this case we are ready even to stifle our moral sense. Our liberty, peace, even conscience, we will readily give away. We will invent some Jesuitic casuistry, will persuade ourselves that it is right for we are doing it for a good purpose, and for some time we will smooth ourselves. . . . Sonechka, Sonechka Marmeladova, eternal Sonechka so long as the world lasts! Have you measured your sacrifice? Is it really right? Can you bear it? Is it of avail? Is it sensible? [16]

By asking such questions, Raskolnikov obviously denied the validity of the old principles which precluded any regard as to the wisdom and the eventual consequences of the inculcated moral duties. Raskolnikov was not able to bargain with his conscience. He could either submit to the old maxims, however great the cost, or reject them altogether.

What Hester Prynne did spontaneously, under the impulse of passion and love, Raskolnikov undertook deliberately, almost like a moral experiment: he, too, defied the accepted moral code in the name of a "consecration of his own." But where Hester succeeded, Raskolnikov suffered defeat. His old conscience proved stronger than his new convictions.[17] In contrast with Hester, he found himself unable to stand up under the appalling social disruption, the feeling of "being

[16] *Crime and Punishment* (Moscow, 1926). Volume v, 39 ff.; passage translated by the author.

[17] Like Hester, Raskolnikov arrived at his new moral standpoint under the influence of radical philosophic ideologies of his days.

a cut off slice," to which the breach with the moral faith of the community doomed him. Like Dimmesdale, Donatello, and Hilda, he was driven irresistibly into public confession of his crime, and into acceptance of the ensuing penalty as the only way to restore the shaken unity.

Why did Raskolnikov fail? Dostoevski's explanation remains vague and vacillating. (Hawthorne, too, never openly and unrestrictedly sided with Hester's moral revolt.) On the one hand, Dostoevski tries to throw doubt on the genuineness of Raskolnikov's innermost motives: was it real unselfishness or rather disguised pride and lust for power? But this, of course, does hardly solve the proper problem raised by Raskolnikov: he *could* have been genuine, he could have been a coming Pasteur or Ehrlich. On the other hand, Dostoevski tells us that only intellectually did Raskolnikov truly believe in his new ideas, while in the depths of his mind there stirred a voice that told him he was wrong. Now Dimmesdale, too, succumbed to his old conscience, yet Hester did not. Was Hester wrong? New moral insights always need time to crystallize into a new security.

Be it as it may, Raskolnikov obviously grapples with the same problem that underlies Hester's and Dimmesdale's drama: Is the individual allowed of his own accord to determine the extent of his social rights and duties? And if so, how far may his wilfulness go? Raskolnikov, like Hester, inclined to Emerson's device: one may go so far as his "constitution" urges him to go. But such unlimited individualism—this is Dostoevski's contention against Raskolnikov—leaving life without standard and guidance, must irretrievably end in social disintegration. Besides, who knows precisely what belongs to his true "constitution," and what not: Do not people often poison and ruin themselves? Modern man would fain believe human nature is good. But whence, then, the power of evil? Is life without sin, is Paradise without Fall possible?

These questions of *The Marble Faun* Dostoevski penetratingly discussed in a small but remarkable story which he published in 1877, in his *Writer's Diary*. It is called "The Dream of a Queer Fellow." [18]

Is Perfection Worth Craving For?

Dostoevski tells the all but Poe-esque story of a young man who, being done with any faith in God and immortality, in spiritual values and a deeper meaning of life, finally arrives at the conclusion that in reality nothing in the world matters, everything being equally unessential and "all the same." The only purpose in life being absolute obliteration, he decides to hasten the immersion in the only real All-one, namely Death.[19]

At the very moment when he is going to make good his decision, he falls asleep, unawares, and sees in his sleep a strange vision. He dreams that he has shot himself; that he was buried; that some preternatural being appeared and carried him away through the measureless spaces of the Universe, depositing him on some far-off star which he discovered to be the Land of the Blessed, a heavenly Paradise, resembling the earth still unpolluted by transgression, and inhabited by supernal beings "who had yet known no sin." Immutable felicity, childlike joy is the lot of those super-men. They incarnate almost godlike perfection. Their life is complete; all their desires are fulfilled. Though they are not immortal death is not dreadful to them, being only the transition to a fuller and final union with the whole of the world. They have

[18] In *Pages from the Journal of an Author*, translated by S. Koteliansky and J. M. Murry (Boston, 1916).

[19] It is worth noting that this conviction, repeatedly stressed by Dostoevski, fully coincides with the state of mind which Hawthorne so emphatically describes in his unfinished novel *Septimius Felton* (Boston, 1883): "We live so little while, that ... it is little matter whether we live or not" (233). "What matters a little tyranny on so short a life? What matters a form of government for such ephemeral creatures?" (*Marble Faun*, XI, 243).

no worship, no earth-like temples, yet all their life is devout unity with the Universe. They are not in need of knowledge and science, for they intuitively know how to live. They have no moral concepts, because mutual love is the very core of their being. Selfishness, hatred, envy, and strife are alien to them.

It is not difficult to discern that Dostoevski is laboring here with the same psychological idea that hovered before Hawthorne in the character of Donatello in *The Marble Faun.* Unbroken oneness with Nature; joy without fear or longing; instinctive knowledge without ratiocination; in short, infancy in perpetuity. And the ill fate that banished Donatello out of his Eden met also the demigods in the vision of Dostoevski's "queer fellow": evil touched and corrupted them. "Like a filthy germ, like an atom of pestilence, infecting whole peoples, so did I infect with my soul that happy land, that knew no sin before me." They learned to lie, and loved lying. Voluptuousness was begotten; jealousy and cruelty ensued. Unity with Nature and fellow-beings vanished. Fear and suspicion appeared; blood was shed. They came to know shame, and made a virtue of it; the idea of honor was born. Wars broke out; they fought for separateness, personality, for "mine and thine." They came to love sufferings, saying that truth can be attained by suffering alone. Science had to replace the lost intuitive knowledge. Ideals and dreams had to make reality bearable. Crime begot the idea of justice, and moral laws had to be prescribed, and then enforced. They forgot their pristine happiness, doubted its very possibility, and even disparaged innocent felicity:

> "Grant," said they, "that we are liars, evil, unjust; we know that and weep for it; ... but we have science, and by her aid we will find the truth again, and this time we will accept it consciously. Knowledge is higher than feeling; the consciousness of life is higher than life. Science will give us wisdom; wisdom will reveal

to us laws, and the knowledge of the laws of happiness is higher than happiness." [20]

Such is the vision of the "queer" fellow, a dream that rejuvenates him, gives his life new meaning, and puts an endless task before him. He has seen in his dream the incarnate "Truth" which he is going to spread and to teach. He knew henceforth that evil is not the normal and inevitable state of man; that he could again become beautiful and happy, if only he wanted to, if he were ready to live up to the law of love, and, above all, renounce the fatal craving for all-penetrating, all-disintegrating knowledge:

> The consciousness of life is higher than life, the knowledge of the laws of happiness is higher than happiness—that is what must be fought! [21]

Again Dostoevski and Hawthorne meet at a decisive point. Ethan Brand went out to search for the Unpardonable Sin, only to discover too late that he was breeding it in his own heart, namely,

> . . . [the] sin of an intellect that triumphed over the sense of brotherhood with man and reverence for God, and sacrificed everything for its own mighty claims! . . . Then ensued that vast intellectual development, which, in its progress disturbed the counterpoise between his mind and heart. The idea that possessed his life operated as a means of education; it had gone on cultivating his powers to the highest point of which they were susceptible. . . . So much for the intellect! But where was the heart? That, indeed, had withered,—had contracted,—had perished! . . . Ethan Brand became a fiend. He began to be so from the moment that his moral nature ceased to keep the pace of improvement with his intellect.

Thus Hawthorne and Dostoevski are one in denouncing the discrepancy between intellect and feeling as the matrix

[20] *Pages from the Journal of an Author*, 26.
[21] *Pages from the Journal of an Author*, 30.

of evil and confusion today. While Hawthorne, however, knew that the sway of pure intuition was broken because of its intrinsic weakness—that the Eden of primordial innocence had proved an uninhabitable place for human nature,—Dostoevski kept on clinging to the dream of a restoration of the lost perfection. And yet, could he remain wholly unaware that so vulnerable a perfection hardly deserves to be called ideal at all? Clearly, instinct alone is not enough. A whit more knowledge (knowledge means foresight!) would have enabled the demi-gods either to wall up their Eden hermetically against any intrusion of evil or to overpower it in valiant fight, and at least to immunize themselves from its fatal contagion. Is a condition of life, even a paradisiacal one, worth craving and striving for, if it is so easily threatened by decay? There are always germs of evil in the world as it is!

This turned out, indeed, to be the crucial question for both Hawthorne and Dostoevski: How could perfection ever be attained and prevail in a world where evil is permitted to play so nefarious and ambiguous a part? Where sin may be corruption and blessing as well? How could a divine Author procreate, how can He tolerate a world like this? The riddle of Good and Evil was the double-edged sword which barred forever the gateway to the old dreams and faiths.

Thus, in the end, the ways of Hawthorne and Dostoevski tragically met again. Not only did the story of "The Marble Faun" break off abruptly; Hawthorne's creative power, his very will to live broke down with it. And Dostoevski? Notwithstanding his determination not to surrender his faith whether it agreed with Truth or not, he admittedly never overcame the Ivan Karamasov, the rebel and questioner, in his own mind; he remained, as he had anticipated, a child of doubt and unsolved struggle all the days of his life.[22]

---

22 See Vladimir Astrov, *Seelenwende, Die Geisteskämpfe der Neuzeit im Spiegel der russischen Literatur* (Freiburg, 1931), 419 ff.

Hawthorne's and Dostoevski's Bequest

Even if one does not accept the hypothesis of Dostoevski's being stirred up by Hawthorne, there can be little dispute as to an ideological kinship between them that can scarcely be explained by the *Zeitgeist* alone.

Neither solved the riddles that haunted them. But their travail was not fruitless. Their probing bequeathed to posterity some permanent insights. They definitely discredited the belief in absolute values—that there are unchangeable moral ideas any more than there exist invariable biological species. And they made it clear that no ideal could longer sway life if it is in discord with essential human needs. These insights alone were not enough to clear the wilderness of right and wrong, ideal and foul, that ensnares the modern mind. But they have helped prepare the way for further inquiries and solutions.

If Hawthorne and Dostoevski were driven into the impasse of rehabilitation of sin, it was because the old principles actually have arbitrarily decried essential and therefore unquenchable impulses as evil and sinful. A higher moral conscience, whose yardstick, as Holzapfel's analysis of moral evolution has shown, will be the unfolding of all truly creative and spiritual powers of mankind, will free the human mind from such discrepancies and nightmares. It will recognize the right of the individual to live up to his "constitution" because there can be no advancement of the whole but through the richest development of its parts. Yet it will fight decidedly all that impoverishes the human mind and clogs its harmonious expansion. Growing culture is always bent towards increasingly *harmonious enrichment of all essential powers* of individuals and groups. Spiritual and social progress needs every creative and life-enhancing faculty, both rational and irrational, science and religion, knowledge and intuition.

Donatello's pagan naturalism, Hilda's shriveled spirituality, the "queer" fellow's stagnant irrationality were attempts

to meet this desire for harmony. Yet the harmony they conceived was one of spiritual paucity, not of fullness of life and growth. However, man's evolution has not yet ended. If a new and higher spiritual synthesis again pervades the soul and life of mankind, then Hawthorne's dream of a "higher, brighter, and profounder happiness" may become reality.

THE ANTECEDENTS OF BROOK FARM

J. B. WILSON

IT has long been recognized that Brook Farm in its inception was either something more or something less than just another experiment in communism similar to those of the Owenites, the Fourierites, the St. Simonians, the Shakers, and the Moravians. Zoltán Haraszti believes that Ripley read Albert Brisbane's exposition of Fourier's scheme, *The Social Destiny of Man*, before Brook Farm was founded, but he admits that the West Roxbury reformers "had their own ideas of Utopia."[1] In his *History of American Socialisms* John Humphrey Noyes states that "the beginnings of the excitement about Fourierism may have secretly affected Dr. Channing and the transcendentalists," yet he declares Brook Farm as originally conceived "not a Fourier formation at all, but an American seedling. It was the child of New England Unitarianism."[2] George Willis Cooke observes that the common table was about the only "communistic" feature of Ripley's settlement during the first two years of its existence.[3] It was a joint-stock company. Individual ownership of property was not restricted. Every member, female as well as male, had a voice in the management. Everyone either paid board or worked for his board, and a uniform wage of one dollar per day was paid for all types of labor. Houses were built for individual occupancy, though there were also dormitories. Orestes Brownson, transcendentalist and frequent visitor at Brook Farm, stated that, although Ripley was well acquainted with all socialistic tracts from Plato's to Fourier's, the West Roxbury undertaking in 1841 and 1842 was not patterned after any previously existing community.[4]

---

1 *The Idyll of Brook Farm, as Revealed by Unpublished Letters in the Boston Public Library* (Boston, 1937), 10.

2 *History of American Socialisms* (Philadelphia, 1870), 104.

3 "Brook Farm," *New England Magazine*, XVII (1897), 395.

4 "Brook Farm," *Democratic Review*, XI (1842), 481.

About six months after the Ripleys and their associates moved to West Roxbury, Miss Elizabeth Peabody wrote in the *Dial* that the Brook Farm experiment realized "Christ's idea of society" by identifying living with learning.[5] In a later article she emphasized that "hours redeemed from labor by community [at Brook Farm] will not be reapplied to the acquisition of wealth, but to the production of intellectual goods."[6] She correctly understood that what George Ripley had founded was a school, "a colony of agriculturists and scholars," as Emerson characterized it.[7] Emerson and Bronson Alcott had projected a similar institution in a letter written to Margaret Fuller in 1840, their description of an "ideal university."[8]

Shortly before he led his teachers and pupils to Brook Farm, Ripley himself had denounced a socialistic project proposed by Edward Palmer, remarking: "The heart must be set right. . . . The social ideas remaining the same, no good would come from the adoption of a new system."[9] As Ripley conceived it, Brook Farm was not a new system. It was simply an "Institute of Agriculture and Education," as he styled it in the "Articles of Association" under which the joint-stock company was organized. Article II of that document reads: "The object of the Association is to purchase such estates as may be required for the establishment and continuance of an agricultural, literary, and scientific school or college, to provide such lands, houses, animals, and apparatus as may be found expedient or advantageous to the main purposes of the Association."[10] From the first, education was central in Ripley's plans. Sophia Ripley, Marianne Ripley, and Charles

5 "A Glimpse of Christ's Idea of Society," *Dial*, II (1841), 227.

6 "Plan of the West Roxbury Community," *Dial*, II (1842), 364.

7 Charles Eliot Norton, editor, *The Correspondence of Thomas Carlyle and Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1885), I, 335.

8 James Eliot Cabot, *A Memoir of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1887), II, 409.

9 Review of Edward Palmer's "A Letter to Those Who Think," *Dial*, I (1840), 254.

10 Octavius Brooks Frothingham, *George Ripley* (Boston, 1882), 112.

A. Dana were immediately appointed as a school committee. Under their direction were established an infant class for children under six, a primary school for those under ten, a six-year college preparatory course, and a three-year discipline in theoretical and practical agriculture.

"The most immediate and at times the only source of income there was the school," Lindsay Swift wrote.[11] This school was praised by Bronson Alcott's associate Charles Lane as greatly superior to the "imitative and book-learned systems" because it was based on the principles of "Pestalozzi and his most enlightened disciples."[12] John Sears recalled that, long before Froebel was ever heard of in New England, a rudimentary kindergarten had been devised at Brook Farm in response to a demand.[13] George P. Bradford, a member of the teaching staff, declared later that Brook Farm was the only institution of learning in New England during the Forties that offered a "varied culture, intellectual, moral, and practical."[14] Georgiana Bruce went there for "six months' opportunity to study American history and arithmetic," subjects not then adequately taught or not offered at all in academies and seminaries for women.[15] Charles Dana, the young Harvard instructor who cast his lot with Ripley's group, defended Brook Farm on the ground that "while anyone was pursuing philosophy and literature and philology and mathematics, he ought to work on the land, to cultivate the earth; and the man who did not work on the land could not have first-rate health."[16] John S. Dwight justified the West Roxbury community as an attempt to "realize practical equality and mutual

---

11 *Brook Farm: Its Members, Scholars, and Visitors* (New York, 1900), 69.

12 "Brook Farm," *Dial*, IV (1844), 353. Lane knew whereof he spoke, for he had just returned from England with Bronson Alcott, where they had been operating the school in Ham, Surrey, established by J. P. Greaves, one-time assistant to Pestalozzi.

13 *My Friends at Brook Farm* (New York, 1912), 109.

14 "Reminiscences of Brook Farm," *Century Magazine*, XLV (1892), 148.

15 "Before I Went to Brook Farm," *Old and New*, III (1871), 177.

16 Quoted by George Willis Cooke, "Brook Farm," *New England Magazine*, XXIII (1897), 394.

culture, and a common-sense education for the children in a larger sense than prevails in ordinary society." [17] George W. Curtis, another member, described the colonists as "a company of highly educated and refined persons" who held that "every person . . . is entitled to mental and moral culture." [18]

Thus, Brook Farm was a natural and inevitable outgrowth of the transcendental cultural ideal. Miss Peabody wrote in 1841:

> The final cause of human society is the unfolding of the individual man into every form of perfection, without let or hindrance, according to the inward nature of each. In strict correspondence to this, the ground idea of the little communities, which are the embryo of the Kingdom to come, must be education.[19]

Education was certainly the "ground idea" of George Ripley's community. Nor should one stop with the tenuous generalization that Brook Farm was an "American seedling," a "child of New England Unitarianism," as historians of the transcendental movement are wont to do. Before establishing his colony in 1841, Ripley had familiarized himself with earlier efforts to combine living and learning—the abortive but courageous projects of Josiah Holbrook, father of the American Lyceum, and of Henry Pestalozzi, Swiss educational pioneer. The "Brook Farm Institute of Agriculture and Education" was patterned partly after Holbrook's Agricultural Seminary and his Lyceum Village, partly after Pestalozzi's farm-school at Neuhof, Switzerland.

Josiah Holbrook, alumnus of Yale and gentleman farmer of Derby, Connecticut, began on his own plantation "one of the first schools in America which sought to teach a popular-

---

17 George Willis Cooke, *John Sullivan Dwight, Brook Farmer, Editor, and Critic of Music* (Boston, 1898), 58.

18 George Willis Cooke, editor, *Early Letters of George William Curtis to John S. Dwight: Brook Farm and Concord* (New York, 1898), 13.

19 "A Glimpse of Christ's Idea of Society," *Dial*, II (1841), 227.

ized form of natural science, and to combine manual labor with education," wrote Henry Barnard in his *American Journal of Education* in 1860. This Agricultural Seminary, at which students paid their expenses by doing farm work, opened in 1824. It was "an agricultural school, where the science of chemistry, and mechanics, and land surveying should be thoroughly drilled into the minds of the pupils by practice," Barnard stated.[20] Holbrook's assistant, the Reverend Truman Coe, explained the venture as follows: "We did what we could to train the students in the analysis of soils, in the application of the mechanical powers to all farming operations, and took out our young men into the field and country for practical surveying, geological excursions, road-making, and the labors of the farm." [21] Meanwhile, in order to increase his own store of scientific information, Holbrook rode daily to New Haven to hear lectures on chemistry and geology delivered by Professor Benjamin Silliman of Yale, founder of the *American Journal of Science*.

The Agricultural Seminary was short-lived, but its successor, the American Lyceum, endured for almost a century. In October, 1826, Holbrook contributed to William Russell's *American Journal of Education* in Boston a prospectus entitled "Associations of Adults for the Purpose of Mutual Education," a plan whereby he expected to "procure for youths an economical and practical education through the community generally," applying the sciences to the domestic and useful arts and to all the common purposes of life. By a

[20] "Josiah Holbrook," *Barnard's American Journal of Education*, VIII (1860), 229.

[21] "Josiah Holbrook," 230. Both subject-matter and method at Brook Farm were remarkably similar to the practical and scientific discipline at the Holbrook Agricultural Seminary. At West Roxbury botany, geology, natural history, and "natural philosophy" were taught outdoors where illustrative material was near at hand, and field trips were made regularly so that the plant and animal life of the region might be observed. Ripley instructed in astronomy by pointing at the stars; Charles Hosmer seemed to know every plant, insect, bird, and animal on the farm; Minot Pratt could give lessons in botany, agricultural chemistry, and agronomy, as well as work wonders with the poor soil. Sears, *My Friends at Brook Farm*, 112–125.

system of "mutual instruction" and with the aid of lectures, discussions, experiments, and demonstrations, Holbrook hoped to make available to members of village Lyceums such courses as "Mechanics, Pneumatics, Chemistry, Mineralology, Botany, Mathematics, History, Political Economy," or any other "political, intellectual, or moral subject." [22] The rapid growth of the Lyceum as a school for adults in New England and the South is by now an oft-told tale. More significant for our present purpose, moreover, is another of Holbrook's almost forgotten attempts at scientific and vocational education, the "Lyceum Village."

The first of these was founded in 1837, twelve miles southwest of Cleveland, Ohio, where Holbrook bought five hundred acres of land, built houses, mills, shops, and a schoolhouse, and soon had a thriving town, Berea. This and a similar colony established at Westchester, New York, were intended to be "centers for the residence of all persons interested in the Lyceum enterprise, for the practical exemplification of its principles in schools, whose teachers and pupils were to spend some portion of every day in manual labor, for the education of teachers, and for the diffusion of the Lyceum system throughout the country." [23]

The Lyceum Village proved to be its founder's undoing. The enterprise failed after three or four years, and Holbrook was left with a huge debt. But his activities had received wide publicity and he had enlisted the support of leading educators and outstanding business and professional men of Boston and its environs.

In the year that Holbrook began his campaign for the Lyceum, George Ripley came to Boston as pastor of a newly organized Unitarian society. Holbrook's board of strategy after 1826 included Bronson Alcott and William Russell,

---

22 "The American Lyceum, or Society for the Improvement of Schools and Diffusion of Useful Knowledge," *Old South Leaflets*, VI, No. 139 (Boston, 1902), 294.

23 "Josiah Holbrook," 235.

the former a leading contributor to, and the latter the editor of, the *American Journal of Education*. Russell, who had taught with Alcott at Germantown, Pennsylvania, before moving to Boston in 1825, was one of the group invited to Dr. William Ellery Channing's home for evening conversations prior to the formation of the Transcendental Club, and he was an occasional visitor to the meetings of that organization. Ripley and other young Unitarian pastors of Boston had assembled at Dr. Channing's study not long after Holbrook founded his first Lyceum Village, to ascertain "whether it were possible to bring cultivated, thoughtful people together, and make a society that deserved the name," Emerson recalled.[24]

Boston had been the center of Holbrook's activities during the decade preceding the organization of the Transcendental Club. In 1828 Daniel Webster was chosen president and George Emerson secretary of a meeting held there for the purpose of forming a Lyceum. Almost every issue of William Russell's *American Journal of Education* after 1828 carried an article about Holbrook's Lyceum and his other projects. In 1830 the first meeting of the State Committee of Lyceums was held in Boston, Russell then proposing that the American Institute of Instruction be made an affiliate of the Lyceum. In 1831 George and Edward Emerson were delegates from Massachusetts to the National Lyceum conference in New York. Henry Ware, of the Divinity School at Cambridge, Congressman Edward Everett, Professor John Farrar of Harvard, and Ripley and other pastors of Boston supported Holbrook's effort to found the Boston Mechanics' Lyceum in 1831. Horace Mann commended the Lyceum in his Third Annual Report to the Massachusetts Board of Education. Several members of the Transcendental Club, Emerson, Thoreau, Ripley Parker, Hedge, and others, were busy lecturing at Concord, Cambridge, Boston, and elsewhere under the

[24] "Historic Notes of Life and Letters in New England," *The Works of Emerson*, Riverside Edition (Boston, 1894), X, 339.

auspices of the various Lyceum groups during the thirties. Meanwhile, Holbrook had established headquarters in Boston, issuing there in 1832 a series of *Scientific Tracts* and a magazine, *The Family Lyceum,* and offering for sale a variety of scientific apparatus intended for use in schools, academies, colleges, and Lyceums.[25]

Owing principally to the efforts of William Russell and Bronson Alcott, the Pestalozzian or Infant-School Society was sponsored by Holbrook's American Lyceum. In his review for the *Christian Examiner* of Biber's *Henry Pestalozzi and His Plan of Education* in 1832, George Ripley stated that before reading the work under consideration he had already become familiar with the doctrines of the man whose system was "destined to exert a great influence on the future welfare of our species."[26] He saw Pestalozzi's program of education as an attempt to reform the great evils of society by a return to nature in the methods of training children, and he felt that the Swiss educator had given his principles the acid test when, in 1774, he gathered together several sons of beggars and outlaws, brought up in poverty and vice, and established for them a "small society" on a farm near Neuhof, Switzerland. Pestalozzi, as did his American disciples, received the pupil "not only as a child of man, but also as a child of God, designed to be restored to the image of divine

---

25 "American Lyceum," *American Journal of Education,* III (1828), 628–633, 701–704, 715–722, and 753–758; IV (1829), 40–50. "The American Lyceum," *Barnard's American Journal of Education,* XIV (1864), 535–558.

26 *Christian Examiner,* XI (1832), 348. Progressive educators in Boston were reading and discussing the following Pestalozzian tracts at that time: William Maclure's *Epitome of Pestalozzian Instruction,* Joseph Neef's *Sketch of a Plan and Method of Education,* the anonymous *Hints to Parents . . . in the Spirit of Pestalozzi's Method,* Hermann Krusi's *Coup D'Oeil on the General Means of Education,* J. P. Greaves's *Exposition of the Principles of Conducting Infant Education,* William Russell's *Manual of Mutual Instruction,* and articles in Russell's *American Journal of Education* discussing the relative merits of the Lancastrian or Monitorial Plan and the Pestalozzian or Mutual Plan. For a detailed treatment of Bronson Alcott's share in the progressive education movement, see Dorothy McCuskey, *Bronson Alcott, Teacher* (New York, 1940).

perfection," Ripley wrote.[27] Furthermore, Pestalozzi attempted, like Ripley afterwards, to prepare young people for the practical duties of life, training them for various vocations and for domestic labors. "The lecture-room was exchanged for the stable, and the sedentary occupations of his study for constant exercise in the open air," Ripley observed.[28] So, Sears recalls, the industrial arts were offered at Brook Farm as a regular part of the school curriculum before such an attempt was made elsewhere in New England, every pupil working under an instructor in the shop, on the farm, in the garden, or in the household.[29] At Brook Farm, as at Neuhof, nothing was imposed as a task, nothing bound down by fixed rules, and no slavish submission required.[30]

Having visited the Brook Farm school in 1842, Orestes Brownson declared it the best he had ever observed, for there the children did more intellectual work and received more instruction than in ordinary schools, yet they suffered no

---

27 Review of Biber's *Henry Pestalozzi and His Plan of Education*, in the *Christian Examiner*, XI (1832), 351 and 356. In his *Observations on the Principles and Methods of Infant Instruction*, 1830, Bronson Alcott had pleaded for "a religious reverence for the infant mind as the image of its author" and had suggested the possibility of a moral education through stories and pictures embodying "those purer and nobler attributes of character around them." His credo of child psychology, on which he based all his teaching, was expressed by Alcott as follows:

"... infant instruction when adapted to the human being is founded on the great principle, that every infant is already in possession of the faculties and apparatus required for his instruction, and that, by a law of his constitution he uses these to a great extent himself; that the office of instruction is chiefly to facilitate this process, and to accompany the child in his progress rather than to drive or even to lead him. *Observations on the Principles and Methods of Infant Instruction* (Boston, 1830), 11, 16, 27. Miss Georgiana Bruce, a member of the educational staff there, testified that the new child-centered theory of pedagogy was known and followed at Brook Farm: "The old system ... poured everything into the memory, and kept pouring, without reference to the natural capacity, or powers of digestion and assimilation. The new plan was precisely the opposite of this; *viz*, to evolve all out of a child's mind by appealing to intuition and reason. Mere knowledge, it was asserted, was valueless; the mind could be early accustomed to observe clearly, and to consider principles which flowed into it through the intuitive faculty." "Reminiscences of Brook Farm," *Old and New*, III (1871), 436.

28 Review of Biber's *Henry Pestalozzi*, 351.

29 Sears, 112.

30 Review of Biber's *Henry Pestalozzi*, 359.

weariness and bad physical and moral effects from confinement, classes being short, informal, and small. He was impressed by the fact that when the young men of the community walked in the woods, they would usually take two or three children with them. Life was so natural there that it "made a discipline without the ugly forms." The young pupils worked and studied because the adults worked and studied.[31]

Another innovation in Pestalozzi's school that Ripley later adopted at Brook Farm was the system of "mutual instruction." "The same man that read a lecture on history one hour, would, perhaps, in the next, sit on the same form with his pupils in a lesson of arithmetic or geometry.... Such facts were of daily occurrence in a house in which everyone was a teacher of what he knew, and everyone, even the head himself, a learner of what he knew not." [32]

Ripley did not reduce Pestalozzi's procedures to any such technical formula as "object-teaching," as do many modern commentators. He was interested more in ideals, principles, and basic philosophies than in method *per se*. In fact, he closes this review with a warning against any attempt to systematize Pestalozzi's practices. Biber's statement of Pestalozzi's belief that "the amelioration of outward circumstances will be the effect, but can never be the means, of mental and moral improvement" is at the very core of the transcendental theory of progress and reform.[33]

---

31 "Brook Farm," *Democratic Review*, XI (1842), 481.

32 Review of Biber's *Henry Pestalozzi*, 364. Emerson wrote in his Journal for 1837: "A valuable fact is, that mutual teaching which went on in Pestalozzi's school, where the tutors quitted their chairs at the end of the hour to go and become with their scholars a class to receive instruction of another teacher, each being thus in turn pupil and teacher." E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes, editors, *The Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1909–1914), IV, 335.

33 Review of Biber's *Henry Pestalozzi*, 355. Emerson quoted these words verbatim in his Journal, adding, "...a paralogism to the old words, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you.'" *Journals*, II, 416.

The influence of early associative movements on Brook Farm must not, of course, be entirely discounted. Nor should one overlook the widespread contemporary demand that subject-matter and method in the schools and colleges should be "practical." Even Emerson, humanist and philosophical idealist, wrote in his Journal for 1839: "The farm, the farm is the right school.... The farm, by training the physical, rectifies and invigorates the metaphysical and moral nature."[34] Goethe had stressed "learning by doing" in his *Wilhelm Meister,* which, in Carlyle's translation of 1824, was one of the early bibles of transcendentalism. Carlyle's "work" doctrine was presented as a social cure-all in *Sartor Resartus.* Ripley's favorite eclectic philosopher, the French author Degerando, had outlined a moral and religious culture which would result in a harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, and spiritual powers and faculties, and he advocated manual labor as a "fundamental and necessary means of education for every individual."[35] The British educator and phrenologist, George Combe, Horace Mann's mentor and friend of the transcendentalists, had defined wisdom as "knowledge of nature and science in all its departments" and had denounced the economic status quo as "inconsistent with the elevation of the moral and intellectual faculties of man which is commanded by religion."[36] Since taking office in 1836 as Secretary to the Massachusetts Board of Education, Mann had sought to introduce a varied training of head, heart, and hand which should be made available to the entire youth of the nation.[37]

---

[34] *Journals,* v, 252.

[35] Elizabeth Palmer Peabody, translator, *Self-Education, or the Means and Art of Moral Progress, Translated from the French of M. Le Baron Degerando* (Boston, 1830), 407.

[36] *The Constitution of Man,* third edition (New York, 1835), 114.

[37] See particularly Mann's "The Necessity of Education in a Republican Government," 1838, and "An Historical View of Education," 1840. Mary Mann and George Combe Mann, editors, *The Life and Works of Horace Mann,* Volume II of *Lectures and Reports* (Boston, 1891), 1–3 and 261 ff.

But in 1840 exemplifications of such pragmatic and democratic doctrines of culture were few. Horace Mann was then just beginning his pioneer work in public education. The "classes" were being trained as gentlemen and scholars, but the masses were neglected. A decadent "Ciceronianism" was the blight of the grammar schools. The "Female Seminaries" were offering French, dancing, music, and embroidery. So when Ripley turned from theory to practice in making his plans for Brook Farm, he found very little that was to his liking. That little, however, was near at hand—Russell's, Alcott's, and Miss Peabody's Pestalozzian schools, and Holbrook's Agricultural Seminary, his Lyceum, and his Lyceum Villages. Prior to 1840 most American experiments in progressive pedagogy were directly or indirectly a result of the labors of a group of Bostonians who, like Ripley and the other transcendentalists, were satellites of the liberal Unitarian pastor, Dr. William Ellery Channing. Brook Farm should take its place alongside Alcott's Pestalozzian Infant-Schools and Miss Peabody's Froebelian Kindergartens as a monument to the transcendental conviction that "culture is the chief end of man." [38]

[38] Emerson, *Journals*, IV, 376.

MEMORANDA AND DOCUMENTS

SOME CORRESPONDENCE OF THE MAINE COMMISSIONERS REGARDING THE WEBSTER-ASHBURTON TREATY

WILLIAM L. LUCEY

IN 1942 the boundary line separating Maine from New Brunswick becomes a century old. For nearly sixty years previous to 1842, a boundary dispute between the two had disturbed the diplomatic relations of the United States and Great Britain. Border squabbles were frequent and generated enough ill feeling to kindle two short-lived outbreaks of bloodless warfare. At last, both governments decided to remove this and other inflammable material from the danger of combustion, and Lord Ashburton spent the late spring and summer of 1842 in Washington, negotiating what has since been known as the Webster-Ashburton Treaty.

Of the tasks with which he was entrusted, Ashburton admitted that the northeastern boundary dispute was "the most important because, beyond measure, the most difficult of all those differences with America which it was the purpose of my special Mission to endeavor to settle." [1] Most of the difficulty came from Maine and Massachusetts, "that wayward and unreliable quarter" [2] of the Union, for the consent of these two states had to be given to any boundary line that differed materially from the one described in the Treaty of 1783. This "most difficult" problem was finally solved when Maine, acting through four commissioners, agreed on July 22, 1842, to a compromise line. The two diplomats, Webster and Ashburton, then proceeded with relative ease to settle the other disputes and to conclude the treaty. Until

1 Dispatch No. 3 from Ashburton to the Earl of Aberdeen, April 25, 1842, Public Record Office, London, Foreign Office, 5, Volume 379, 1. Photostats, Library of Congress.

2 *The Diary of Philip Hone, 1828–1851*, edited by Allan Nevins (New York, 1936), 614.

that hour, however, Lord Ashburton had been ready on more than one occasion to return to London empty-handed.

The literature on the northeastern question is formidable, and one can, if not cautious, become as confused as the original boundary line.[3] Nearly every angle of the dispute has been discussed by partisans and scholars, so that today little remains to be said about it. Curiously, however, the four Maine men who caused Webster and Ashburton so many anxious hours have escaped notice except for a passing reference to their obstinacy. Yet they played more than a minor role in this important event. Had they returned to Augusta without consenting to a compromise line, it is highly probable that Ashburton would have returned to London without a treaty, and border disputes would have continued until war settled the boundary. Aware of the consequences of a refusal, the commissioners sacrificed what they, and Daniel Webster, considered the rights of their state for the welfare of their nation.[4]

At this late date, one hundred years after the event, the four Maine commissioners[5] should be allowed to speak for themselves. Perhaps they would have had an audience long ago had their correspondence been available, for they exchanged many letters among themselves before and after the trip to Washington. Some of these letters[6] are here printed. A perusal of them indicates two facts worthy of note: first, the commissioners themselves were satisfied, despite the conviction that Maine deserved a better treatment than she received, that they had done what was right

---

[3] Samuel F. Bemis and Grace G. Griffin, *Guide to the Diplomatic History of the United States, 1775–1921* (Washington, 1935), 280–288.

[4] This fact was stressed in their report to the governor of Maine, the original of which is preserved in the Maine State Library.

[5] They were Edward Kavanagh, William Pitt Preble, Edward Kent, and John Otis. Kavanagh had been in Congress (1831–1835) and our diplomatic representative in Portugal (1835–1841). Preble, a prominent jurist, had been minister to the Hague when the boundary dispute was arbitrated by the King of the Netherlands. Kent was Maine's most prominent Whig and had twice been governor. Otis was an outstanding lawyer and a member of the state legislature. Kavanagh and Preble were Democrats, the other two, Whigs.

[6] The letters are in the Edward Kavanagh Collection in the archives of the Catholic Diocese of Portland. Monsignor George P. Johnson has kindly permitted the use of them. The staff of the American Antiquarian Society has generously helped in identifying persons named.

and best; secondly, they discovered that the people of Maine generally agreed with them. This favorable reaction of Maine has escaped notice because too much attention was paid to the partisan criticisms of some politicians of the contemporary political parties, the Whigs and the Democrats. The boundary dispute had been a violent political issue in the State for many years, and the criticisms were for the most part attempts to derive some last profit from an issue that had been killed.

Not all the letters exchanged by the four commissioners are included in this collection, but Edward Kavanagh was a sort of clearing house for the group, and the opinions of all are fairly represented in the correspondence he saved. He wrote often to the other three, and they, in return, wrote to him; the other three did not exchange many letters. The communications began, it will be noticed, immediately after the appointment of the commission and continued until the four met for the first time in Boston, on June 8, on their way to Washington. From that date until June 22, when the consent of Maine was given to the line proposed by Webster, their interchange of opinions was verbal—and if Preble's anticipations were sound, violent. After June 22 the correspondence was renewed, and continued until the four met in Bangor late in October to draft the official report to the governor.

Long before Webster asked Governor John Fairfield to call a special session of the legislature to co-operate in the settlement of the dispute, Edward Kavanagh had been kept well informed on Washington events by Senator Reuel Williams of Augusta. The Senator introduces the subject by making some observations on the failure of Ashburton to arrive on time.[7]

[Senator Reuel Williams to Kavanagh][8]

WASHINGTON MARCH 5, 1842

DEAR SIR

Your favor of 28th inst. was recd last evening....

The delay of Lord Ashburtons arrival causes some anxiety for

[7] In transcription, dashes used to end sentences (when followed by a capital) have been replaced by periods.

[8] Under the date of April 5, 1842, Philip Hone recorded: "by this time it is probable he [Ashburton] and Mr. Webster have gotten *toe to toe*...." *Diary*, 595.

his safety. Mr. Webster told me two days ago that he trusted he would arrive in season to communicate to Gov Fairfield before your adjournment,

Yours respectfully
R. WILLIAMS

[Williams to Kavanagh][9]

WASHINGTON APRIL 4, 1842

DEAR SIR

Your favor of 26 ult° came last night. . . .

Lord Ashburton is said to have arrived at Anapolis & will be here to night. Ere long we shall know his powers & intentions as to the boundary question. The feeling here is that we are not to have war, but no one seems to know how it is to be avoided.

Yours respectfully
R. WILLIAMS

[Williams to Kavanagh][10]

SENATE CHAMBER
APRIL 11, 1842

PRIVATE

DEAR SIR

Lord Ashburton announces his authority & wish to make a conventional line—letters go to day to Gov. Fairfield & to Gov. Davis asking that these states will put it [within the] power of the Genl Government to make a line provided it & the terms shall be assented to by agents to be appointed by the states & each of them. Lord Ashburton is entirely silent as to what line he wants or the equivalents he will assent to.

Mr Webster believes it a favorable time to make a good line & good terms.

---

9 At the outset of the negotiations, proposals were submitted, apparently, to the Maine delegates by members of the American Peace Society for settling the dispute amicably. Among the papers in the Kavanagh collection is such a document, which someone has labeled: "Prof. [Benwick? Berwick?] proposition Apl. 2, 1842." Efforts to identify the professor have failed; he was probably the Reverend George C. Beckwith, who had taught at Andover Theological Seminary, had been pastor of a Portland church (1832–1835), and in 1842 was connected with the American Peace Society. *General Catalogue of the Andover Theological Seminary, 1808–1908* (Boston, 1909), 88–89. The suggestions represented a common view among non-politicians: (1) Maine should accept a compromise line; (2) the free navigation of the St. John and a financial indemnity would be satisfactory equivalents.

10 Senator Williams strenuously opposed ratification of the Webster-Ashburton treaty in the Senate. At this date, however, he was not opposed to a conventional line.

I would not say that there is danger of our question being mixed with others or made to compensate for favors to the nation or other sections of it, but it has been intimated by some. If the terms are required to be approved by Maine we will avoid that hazard, if it be of any importance. I know not what the feeling in Maine is upon this question but it seems to me that the delay & hazard of a settlement by means of an arbitration are very considerable, & that we shall not humble ourselves by agreeing to hear what Great Britain shall propose, & if satisfactory, by assenting to it.

Yours truly
R. WILLIAMS

[Governor John Fairfield to Kavanagh]

SACO APL. 16, 1842

HON. E. KAVANAGH

Dear Sir, As was anticipated by us when the session of the Legislature closed I have received a communication from Mr. Webster in regard to the boundary question. I have this moment returned from Portland where I went for the purpose of consultation with our friends as to the course which should be pursued. I am now desirous of obtaining advice from other quarters and for this purpose have taken liberty to address you.

Mr. Webster says Lord Ashburton has come clothed with full powers to settle all questions in controversy between the two countries—That in regard to the boundary question he has officially announced to our government "that he has authority to treat for a conventional line, or line by agreement, on such terms and conditions and with such mutual considerations and equivalents as may be thought just and equitable; and that he is ready to enter upon the negotiations so soon as this, (the Genl.) Government shall say that it is authorized and ready on its part, to commence such negotiations." He says further that Lord Ashburton will remain but a short time in the country and requests that our Legislature be convened and the subject submitted to its grave and serious consideration.

Now my Dear Sir, what ought I, under these circumstances, to do? Convene the legislature or not? It is an important question—of too much moment to the State to justify me in acting upon my own opinions alone. Will you think of the matter & consult others if you choose and give me the result in a few days?

I ought perhaps to add that I find our friends in Portland nearly unanimous in favor of calling the Leg. together. How they will be found elsewhere I do no know.

I would write you more fully if I had time—

Very truly yours
JOHN FAIRFIELD

I have omitted to say that Mr. Webster proposes to [the] governments of Maine & Massachusetts that they should severally appoint commissioners to confer with the authorities of the Genl. Govt. upon the subject, with an understanding *that no line shall be agreed upon without the assent* of *such commissioners.*

He adds that without authority from Maine & Massachusetts the Genl. Govt. will do nothing but proceed with the negotiations for another *arbitration.*

[Webster to Kavanagh][11]

BOSTON, MAY 17, 1842

PRIVATE

DEAR SIR:

Herewith I enclose three copies of a private letter addressed by me to a friend on the subject which is soon to engage the attention of the Legislature of which you are a member.

One of them is intended for your own use, and one I will thank you to present to the President of the Senate, and the other to the Speaker of the House of Representatives as private letters.

With much true regard
Your obedient servant
DANL WEBSTER

[Extract of Webster's letter][12]

. . . A fear has been entertained,—I hope not extensively—that the governmcnt might be willing to surrender interests of Maine, for equivalents to be found elsewhere. Certainly no such purpose ever was, or ever will be, entertained by me for a moment, and full assurance, in this respect, is given to the State by the declaration that no treaty will be signed for a line by Convention, till it be assented to with all its terms, conditions, and equivalents, by her own Commissioners. They will take care that if any thing be yielded which Maine claims, the equivalent received for it will be such as shall enure [*sic*] to the benefit of Maine itself. . . .

---

11 Kavanagh was chairman of the legislature's joint committee on the boundary dispute.

12 This entry is an extract from a copy of a letter by Webster and probably is the one Webster enclosed; there is no way of identifying the original recipient. It shows how carefully Webster was handling Maine.

[Francis O. J. Smith to Kavanagh][13]

BOSTON MAY 27/42

D SIR

Mr Webster is out of town is expected in to day—I have left a note for him to have immediately on his return—apprising him of your request—He will write you & Mr. Otis—

Very truly
your ob ser
FRANCIS O. J. SMITH

[William P. Preble to Kavanagh][14]

DEAR SIR

I wrote you in great haste a note yesterday as the mail was closing in reply to one from you then just received. I gave you then my first impressions. Further consideration has led me to feel still more strongly the necessity of a meeting of the Commissioners before they undertake the business of their mission. There are interests of Maine to be considered among us before we hold communion with or meet *any* body, as Commissioners. A certain degree of organization is necessary for the orderly conducting of the business. Certain points are to be settled before we begin to act. There will undoubtedly be much violent discussion between us and others. The business will be complicated with embarrassing questions of expediency perhaps of right. Now I for one feel unwilling to embark on a mission so pregnant with momentous consequences without first meeting my colleagues and preparing ourselves to encounter the skill and sagacity with which we shall be brought in conflict. I know too much about the difficulties and history of this controversy and what we have yet to meet to permit me to embark "tête baissée," as Mr. Otis seems to have done according to the statement of your note to me. I renew to you then the proposition to meet in this city and spend one or two days here in making the necessary preliminary arrangements and fixing upon some principles. You will I know excuse my frankness in this matter for we are now embarked in the same ship excepting that probably I shall get all the cursing and you all the praise.

with great respect Dr Sir and your friend
and very humble servant
WM. P. PREBLE

PORTLAND MAY 28, 1842

---

13 Smith was a Portland lawyer, former congressman, editor, and man of influence in the Democratic party. Webster had wisely persuaded him to work for a treaty.

14 Both Webster and Ashburton feared Preble. He was very frank, as he

[Kavanagh to Preble][15]

DAMARISCOTTA MILLS,
30TH MAY 1842.

DEAR SIR:

Your favors the 27th and 28th instant has been received and my answer is retarded, one day, by a late withdrawal of Mail-facilities from this place.

Having no copy of my note addressed to you from Augusta, on Thursday last, I do not know that it explains sufficiently its object. Immediately after the election of Commissioners, and while making preparations for instant departure from Augusta, it occurred to me that the other Gentlemen who composed the Commission would wish to have from Mr. Otis and myself some suggestions as to the *time* when we were expected to enter upon the discharge of our duties.

I presume that you need not be assured that I was *then*, as *now*, aware that many points were to be settled before we could begin to act with effect; and that it was no part of my plan to rush into the negotiations without previous arrangements, and a full understanding between ourselves. And, while on this subject, you will excuse me for remarking that a phrase, at the close of your last letter, is susceptible of a construction not creditable to me as a public officer charged with a responsible trust, although I cannot believe that it was so intended.

After having penned the foregoing, I am in receipt of a letter from Mr Webster dated, at Boston, the 28th inst. in which he expresses a hope that we may assemble at Washington as early as the 10th or 12th of June; and he further states that a similar communication is transmitted to each of the Commissioners.

Presuming that I am the only one of the Commissioners who has been in communication with you in regard to the time of our meeting, perhaps I cannot better give effect to your wishes than by addressing, this day, notes to Messrs. Kent and Otis suggesting the expediency of our assembling at Portland, on Friday next, for the purposes that you have indicated; and to avoid the inconveniences of delay, I shall endeavor to have the notes mailed immediately at the next office on the route.

With the highest respect,
Dear Sir,
your obedient Servant
E KAV

HON. WM. P. PREBLE
PORTLAND.

admits in this letter, and had opposed acceptance of the award made by the King of the Netherlands.

[15] This is Kavanagh's copy of the letter. He did not relish Preble's frankness. Evidently they became better acquainted on the trip, for Preble's letters written after his departure from Washington are warm and friendly.

[John Otis to Kavanagh]

HALLOWELL MAY 31, 1842

HON E. KAVANAUGH,[16]

DEAR SIR,

I have time, being just ready to start for Bangor, to say to you that I recd. a letter from Mr Webster yesterday, in which he says he desires us to be at Washington 10th or 12th of June. He says he has written to each of the commissioners,—but fearing you might not get his letter & having an opportunity I have written this—of course our plan need not be changed unless we can meet in Boston Tuesday instead of Wednesday. I shall mention this to Mr Kent.

In haste
Truly yours
JOHN OTIS

[Edward Kent to Kavanagh][17]

BANGOR JUNE 1 1842

DEAR SIR,

Your favor of the 30th ult has been received, and in reply I can only say that I was desirous of meeting at Augusta or Portland before leaving the State. But Mr Otis, who is now here & who I presume will write you by the same mail that carries this has found it impossible to arrange his private business so as to be in Portland before Tuesday night. Under these circumstances I do not see that any better arrangement can be made, in order to reach Washington next week, than to meet at Boston Tuesday morning next. I should have been pleased to meet at Portland, but I do not know that it is of any great importance, so far as any thing substantial & essential is concerned. I shall leave in the boat for Portland on Monday morning and I fear if we wait for a meeting then on Wednesday that we shall be detained too long.

With great regard
Your obd servt
EDW KENT

HON MR KAVANAGH

---

16 Otis misspelled Kavanagh's name in all his letters. Kavanagh did not bother, it seems, to correct him; from his youth his family name had been incorrectly written and by this time he had abandoned all hope of having the correct spelling accepted.

17 Otis wrote to Kavanagh under the same date but since the letter contains the same information it is omitted. The four met in Boston, and correspondence was suspended until the commissioners separated after the consent of Maine was given.

[Farnsworth to Kavanagh][18]

SOUTH NORRIDGEWOCK JUNE 23 1842

HON EDWARD KAVANAUGH

D SIR

Since the adjournment of the Legislature I have had opportunity to ascertain public sentiment in relation to the appointment of Commissioners with full power & whatever objection was felt at first by those sincerely disposed to adjust the vexed question to giving such power I think has been given up & the public mind settled down on the conviction that the course adopted by the Legislature was the proper one The minority of the Legislature some of whom I have no doubt were anxious to do right but much the larger number were looking to a War with England and desirous of office in the Army in such an event All now feel that War is out of the question although the Madisonian occasionally blows the trump of alarm. The cold and dry weather continued until the 11 June when snow fell on the hills in this vicinity & to the depth of two feet on the high land between here and Quebec Since that we have rain & warm weather I hope we may realize the fond anticipations formed of the success of your Commission in the settlement of the long vexed question of Boundary....

Sincerely & truly
yours
D. FARNSWORTH

HON E. KAVANAUGH
WASHINGTON CITY

[John Anderson to Kavanagh]

PORTLAND JULY 6 1842

DEAR SIR—

I have this moment recd yours of the 2d inst....

I regret that our prospects of a speedy settlement of the Boundary are no better. Our people here now generally apprehend no adjustment. There is a strong tendency in the public mind for decisive measures if you are compelled to return without having closed the question. I believe it will be out of the powers of the Genl Govt to prevent our people from taking possession to our line, if the British proposition shall be such as is now anticipated....

Very truly your
friend & obt sert
JOHN ANDERSON

---

[18] This and the next letter indicate the attitude of some persons in Maine while the negotiations were in progress. John Anderson had been in Congress with Kavanagh.

[Kavanagh to Gov. Fairfield][19]

WASHINGTON, 23D JULY, 1842

SIR:

We have the honor to enclose a copy of our communication to Mr Webster, of yesterday's date, in answer to his note of the 15th instant, in which he made a proposition, in behalf of the Executive of the United States, for a conventional line between the State of Maine and the adjoining British Provinces.

As yet, we are not informed whether any more remains to be done, on our part, in full execution of the Commission with which we are charged. But, if further delay of our departure from this city should be necessary, we shall continue to keep you advised of our proceedings.

We have the honor to be, Sir,
with the highest respect,
your obedient servants

P.S. Judge Preble left this city for Maine, before the accompanying copies could be in readiness for transmission.

[Kent to Kavanagh][20]

WASHINGTON JULY 29 1842

DEAR SIR,

As you are entitled to know some thing, (or rather every thing) in relation to the progress of our business and the State of matters here, I write this note to say, that we have been at work in looking after the details and the language of the various articles. The navigation clause will, I think, secure all we required, giving both parties where the river is the dividing line equal rights in the whole breadth, & to us the right to run freely with our lumber, in its various forms, in rafts boats or otherwise to [and] from the seaport at the mouth—also unmanufactured agricultural products of the St. John or its tributaries. We had every thing as to tolls, duties &c whether reciprocal or not stricken out. The other matters in relation to the funds and to the rights of settlers—& the division of islands and our compensations will be fixed about right. Mr Otis & myself dined *en familie* with his Lordship a day or two since & after dinner the old gentleman was

[19] This is Kavanagh's copy of the letter. Preble was the last of the four to capitulate, and it seems that he suddenly departed while Kavanagh was busy notifying Governor Fairfield of the completion of their mission, for in the place for signatures the names of Kavanagh, Kent, and Otis are written (in Kavanagh's hand) and Preble's name was begun and then crossed out. The postscript was then added.

[20] Kavanagh was the second of the Maine commissioners to start for home. Kent and Otis remained in Washington several days longer.

very pleasant and yielding.[21] I think every thing will go right into the treaty. Mr Webster, in a call we made today insisted that we should remain, until the matters were put into final shape for engrossing. I felt a great reluctance, but finally yielded. So we shall probably have to remain until Monday or Tuesday of next week. I regret this, as I had hoped to meet you & Mr Allen in N York and go up the north river with you. We have rather solitary times here now. We have relinquished our parlor & betaken ourselves to the old Bay State. Charles is still attentive but his ice has failed so we have to dispense with cream. The cards lie untouched and in sober truth we are a changed set. Homeward bound is our feeling & we linger with regrets. But I am satisfied that duty requires us to remain, as a few words may change very materially our rights, and the fault would be visited upon us for leaving. I hope you will write Gov Fairfield and explain why we remain and your views of the propriety & necessity of it.

The weather is hot, and we sweat every hour of the twenty four. I hope you do not find yourself any worse for journeying. If Mr Allen is with you, give him my respects and say to him that I have visited the market once since he left.

Very truly
Yours

E. KAVANAGH ESQ. EDW KENT

[Otis to Kavanagh]

PHILA. AUGUST 2, 1842

HON. EDWARD KAVANAUGH,
MY DEAR SIR,

You will see by the date of this letter, that I am on my way, "homeward bound," & I assure it affords me no little pleasure that I am away from Washington with which I have become thoroughly tired. Mr Kent, Mr [Abbott] Lawrence, Mr [John] Mills[22] & myself, the last *remnant* of the commissioners took the cars last evening at 6 o'clock. Mr Lawrence & Lady remained at Baltimore, & will be here this afternoon. Mr Mills continued on this morning to New York, & Mr Kent & I will follow him tomorrow morning, & I trust I shall be at home Saturday morning. The

---

21 Lord Ashburton was not a career diplomat, but this reference to his pleasant and yielding manners *after* the dispute was settled indicates his ability to bargain. This was the first occasion the Maine commissioners found his lordship in a yielding mood.

22 Abbott Lawrence and John Mills were commissioners of Massachusetts.

articles of the treaty relating to our business were reduced to writing, engrossed & read over carefully by us before we left, & engagement made by Mr Webster & Lord A. that they should be inserted in the treaty in the same language. The only article not agreed upon is the Creole affair—this is a matter of some delicacy, & not so easily disposed of, as the President lately told of the matter. I know not what the result may be. I am glad to see the tone of the newspapers from Maine that I have seen. I have no doubt our friend Judge Preble has contributed to this by his being on the ground & making the proper explanations. We owe him our thanks for this, as well as for his industry while with us. I suppose you have seen him on your way home. . . .

I suppose a detail of our proceedings after you left would not be interesting to you. I felt your absence & was more impatient to be off.

Your sincere friend
JOHN OTIS

[Preble to Kavanagh]

PORTLAND AUGUST 10, 1842

MY DEAR SIR

Your note of the 4th at Boston has been received. On my return to this place I did what I could to give a favorable direction to public opinion. And here and in York county all is well. I have received one letter from our friend Kent at Washington dated July 29th. I learn that he has since left. I have been over to Saco to see the Gov. He is very desirous of having the correspondence &c published. I am looking anxiously for news—but learn nothing. The better portion of the community is all with us. We have little to fear. I think now we had better wait and see the action of the Senate &c. I hope you and your good sister have arrived safe at home. Do let me hear from you soon and don't fail to let me know how she does and has borne her journey. I do not mean that she should think I have got over my dissatisfaction with her for going off and hiding herself away in Emmetsburg instead of coming like a good sister to Washington and staying with you. We should have seen her then. But no matter.

With great respect my dear Sir I am very sincerely your friend and

obedient servant
WM. P. PREBLE

HON EDWARD KAVANAGH
NOBLEBOROUGH
ME

[Kent to Kavanagh]

BANGOR AUGUST 16 1842

DEAR SIR,

I did not reach home until Saturday evening last, having remained in Massachusetts about a week. I found your letter here awaiting my arrival. I was very sorry to find that your old enemy was still troubling you, and I fear you found your whole journey fatiguing & painful. I trust that you have found relief since your return.

I have been highly gratified to find so general and hearty approval of our proceedings by the sober, discreet & honest men of the State. In this community I have scarcely met with a man who is not well satisfied that it was much better to settle as we did than to leave the subject open for future reference or as an open question. Most of our people go farther & say they think we have made an excellent bargain and better than they expected. A few uneasy spirits attempt to find fault or to doubt and cavil and I see "the Democrat" of today is disposed to speculate upon some points and to insinuate doubts & fears. But I am assured and I have no doubt that the great mass of the people are well satisfied and that the final result will be a general acquiescene [*sic*] in the arrangement. The bug bear of military advantages on the strip will not frighten any body. The Argus[23] has taken an honorable and fair stand and if the candid, judicious and independent men of all parties stand firm those attempts to create a breeze will be total failures. I think we have cause to congratulate ourselves that so good a spirit prevails in the State and that we are judged so fairly & candidly. I have no fears that injustice will be done to us in the final judgment of the people.

I hardly know what to say in relation to our meeting. I must leave that to your decision. I can attend any time before the middle of September. I think it would be well to be assured of the ratification of the treaty at Washington before making up our report. I think also it would be well for us each to be making minutes of points to be considered and inserted. I wish you would draw up the report. It properly belongs to you to do it and if your health will permit I trust you will do it. I have heard nothing from Gov Fairfield and do not know how he regards the settlement. I see Bro Otis has made a speech on our subject at the Whig County Convention. I should have preferred *if any speech was to be made,* that it should have been at some [neutral[24]] meeting. I have seen the resolves [of the] Democratic convention

23 The *Eastern Argus*, published in Portland, was the leading Democratic paper in the state.

24 Several words here are illegible.

in Kennebec but I regard them as the expression [only] of a few managers & not the real voice of the people. The great object seems to be to kill Webster. But the country is more anxious for an honorable settlement of the question than for the fate of any politician.

Very truly
Your friend & obd sert
EDWARD KENT

HON E KAVANAGH

[Otis to Kavanagh]

HON EDWARD KAVANAUGH,

HALLOWELL SEPT. 11, 1842

MY DEAR SIR,

It gave me much pleasure to hear from you, & as I was going to Bangor, I delayed answering it till my return. I saw Mr Kent & had much conversation with him on the events of our late mission and its result, & the manner in which it has been received in the country, & particularly in this State. We both agreed that we had nothing to condemn ourselves for, either in the conducting or termination of it. I trust you have been led to the same conclusion. I saw Mr Bronson yesterday who said he saw Judge Preble the day before, & he stated to him that he was satisfied that under the circumstances we did right to give the assent we did to the terms proposed. This is the first direct information I have had from our late worthy colleague. I feared that the opposition of the Age[25] & some other papers might influence his mind against the final determination we arrived at.

I had some conversation with Mr Kent about our report to the Governor, & our application for payment. He says he must be at Portland on the 19th to attend the sitting of circuit court, & will be detained a week or ten days. The Governor will be here in Executive session on the 21st & will remain a week or ten days. We left the matter undetermined, & I told him I would write to you, & he would see & consult Judge Preble. It is desirable that we should make our report at the present session of the Governor & council, though I believe the council have nothing to do with it. It is to them however we are to apply for a settlement of our accounts. The two matters are not necessarily connected, tho it would be desirable to have the report made up & communicated before we apply for pay. All this I submit to your judgement. I am ready to help make up, or to agree to a report at an early day.

[25] *The Age* was a Democratic paper published in Augusta. Francis O. J. Smith had been editor of it in 1831 but obviously had lost all influence over its policy.

I am glad you consented to be a candidate for the Senate, for though, as a party man, I am not to wish you success, yet I am sure from the temper of the people of your county, you will receive the full vote of your party. I am also a candidate, & shall not receive the full vote of the Whigs. This will be partly from pretended disaffection with the treaty, they having formed what they call an anti treaty party, & partly from disappointment, & a general spirit of disaffection. What the result of tomorrows vote will be I know not;[26] but personally I feel no interest in securing a seat in the Senate. You & I know how little this is to be desired from past experience. . . .

Respectfully & truly
your friend
JOHN OTIS

[Preble to Kavanagh]

PORTLAND SEPT 12, 1842

DEAR SIR

Your favor of the 5th inst was received last week. . . .

I have received many congratulations on the settlement of the boundary question. *I* am not reconciled to it, and *never shall be;* nor to the manner in which and by which the Commissioners from Maine obstinately persisted in suffering themselves to be drawn into the vortex. The course adopted by the Argus has in the main been very manly and independent. Occasionally it has gone beyond *the mark* in my opinion. The course which "The American" [27] may pursue is to me a problem. I doubt whether it takes decided ground. I have heard nothing from Kent or Otis. In this quarter of the State public opinion is most decidedly with the Commissioners.

With great respect Dr Sir I am very truly
your friend and obedient servant

THE HONBLE EDWARD KAVANAGH WM. P. PREBLE

[Kent to Kavanagh]

BANGOR OCT 12 1842

MY DEAR SIR,

Col Otis is now here and has been here for a week—he left in a day or two after you. He does not give any very flattering account of our prospects as to remuneration. But I hope they will

---

26 Otis was defeated, as he anticipated. Kavanagh was the only one of the commissioners who was in the Maine Legislature of 1843, but he was elected President of the Senate, a position which allowed him some influence over the members.

27 A newspaper published in Portland.

allow us enough to cover expenses at least. But they must do as they please. I have no doubt you presented the matter in its true light to the council and that all has been done & said that the occasion required.

What do you think of the prospect for our report. I very much fear that the court being now in session the Judge [Preble] will not find time to work on the matter and that we shall be without the document he promised. But I hope for the best. I had a short conversation with Gen Hodgman the other day & presented to him some of the same views I did to you in relation to the importance of taking early & decided grounds at Augusta in opposition to the few [*sic*] but active opposition. I think he feels right on the subject. . . .

EDWARD KENT

[Preble to Kavanagh][28]

PORTLAND OCT 24TH, 1842

DEAR SIR

Your favor of the 22nd was received this morning—at the same time I also received a letter from Mr Kent informing me that Mr Otis is now in Bangor and proposing with the assent of Mr Otis that we should meet at Bangor say on Thursday of this week, if agreeable to you and to myself. The steamboat leaves this place on Wednesday morning and as it is said usually arrives at East Thomaston[29] before noon. They request me to communicate with you and for you and I to agree to meet them at Bangor as proposed. For one I am willing more especially as that would seem to facilitate your views as expressed in your favor of the 22nd inst. Supposing then that I shall be acting in accordance with your views as well as with those of our colleagues I shall leave this place Wednesday morning, God willing in the hope of meeting you at East Thomaston and accompanying you to Bangor. We can then talk over together the various points of interest to which you have referred in your letter to me if such a course would meet with your approbation and concurrence.

With great respect Dr Sir
your very obedient servt

HON EDWARD KAVANAGH — WM. P. PREBLE

---

[28] The report of the Commission, kept at the Maine State Library, was written by Preble.

[29] Where Kavanagh would board it.

THOREAU AND COLLEGE DISCIPLINE

FREDERICK T. MCGILL

PROFESSOR RAYMOND ADAMS, in his article "Thoreau at Harvard," [1] has shown us a spirited, warm-hearted boy who was not only among the graduates of 1837, but of them as well. An unpublished volume in the Harvard University Archives[2] lends support to this interpretation, and helps at the same time to explain the recollection of John Weiss, a classmate of Thoreau at Harvard, who recalled in 1865 that "Thoreau disappeared while our young absurdity held its orgies." [3]

The "young absurdity" of that day was apparently exceeded only by the mature absurdity of the college authorities. As individuals the Harvard professors of the 1830's were concerned with imparting knowledge and skills, but the Faculty as a body was occupied with problems of student morality. Day after day, sometimes in both morning and evening, they sat in judgment and imposed sentences, ranging from a private admonition to a request that the boy "take up his connexions." Ten students who were discovered "grouping" in the college yard received the minimum penalty; and such apparently was the punishment of James Russell Lowell, '38, who was referred to the President for wearing a brown coat on Sunday instead of the black or black-and-white mixture prescribed. But Lowell came close to running the gamut of penalties. For a second offense he was publicly admonished, and for cutting his seat in the recitation room he was fined a dollar. Later came the six-weeks suspension at the end of his senior year for continued neglect of his studies—a combination of moral and intellectual delinquency. More sensational was the

[1] Raymond Adams, "Thoreau at Harvard: Some Unpublished Records," *New England Quarterly*, XIII (March, 1940), 24–33.

[2] The material from the Faculty minutes reproduced herein is taken from Volume XI of the Records of the Harvard Faculty. Supporting data regarding the students involved are from the Record of Admissions, 1829–1847. I am indebted to Mr. Clifford K. Shipton, Custodian of the Harvard University Archives, for his kind assistance; and to Dean William Scott Ferguson for permission to quote from these sources.

[3] See Weiss's reminiscences in the *Christian Examiner* of July, 1865, quoted at length by Professor Henry Seidel Canby in *Thoreau* (Boston, 1939), 45–47.

career of Pliny Earle Chase, '39, suspended during his freshman year for cracking walnuts in chapel. Reinstated as a sophomore, Chase earned a private admonition for an improper attitude and sleeping at church. Presently he was suspended once more, this time for throwing two snowballs in chapel during service. Yet Chase, like Lowell, graduated with his class.

The careful penmanship of the Faculty minute-book yields fewer references than one might wish to David Henry Thoreau (that was his name then) of the Class of 1837. The original vote of matriculation; the award of a "detur"[4] in February, 1835; the assignment of one-half of a Greek dialogue for the July Exhibition of 1835, and of a Commencement part in 1837; and the final recommendation for a degree;—these would be all, but for an episode which haled Thoreau, freshman, in person before the Faculty and spread—or at least sprinkled—his name on the minutes of several meetings. Here is the official account:

[June 30, 1834.] Dr. Ware reported that offensive noises had been made at prayers by members of the Freshmen [*sic*] Class, during the services; and the Proctors Osgood and Frost being examined and thereupon it was Voted To examine the Freshmen Class, individually. Whereupon the Faculty began forthwith to examine every individual in the Class and after proceeding sometime it was Voted to postpone the farther examination until tomorrow at 8 o/c. A.M. Adjourned.

[At the meeting of July 1 at 8 A.M. the examination of individuals was continued.]

[July 1, 1834, 7 P.M.] Huger,[5] having confessed that he was concerned in the disturbances of June the 30th Whereupon voted, That his probation be closed.

The evidence resulting from the examination of the Freshman Class having satisfied the Faculty that Whitney[6] was one of

---

[4] *Detur:* "A specially bound book awarded to each undergraduate who has done work of a certain grade during the preceding year, and has not before received this honor. *Harvard College.*" (Webster's *New International Dictionary.*)

[5] Joseph Alston Huger, son of Daniel E. Huger of Charleston, South Carolina. Suspended while a freshman in July, 1834, Huger was readmitted as a junior in August, 1835. In January, 1837, as a senior, he received permission to be absent from college for the current term because of weakness in his eyes; and he withdrew permanently in April of that year.

[6] Giles Henry Whitney, son of Abel Whitney, of Boston. Suspended in his freshman year, he was admitted the following December to the sophomore

those, who made a noise at prayers in the Chapel, on the evening of the 30th June last, or must know, who, in his vicinity, did make a noise, thereupon Voted that Whitney be sent for and appear at the adjournment.

[July 2, 1834.] Whitney appeared, as ordered, and prayed for a reexamination, in relation to his conduct at prayers, of Thoreau and Wheeler;[7] which being considered and largely debated it was thereupon Voted, That in consideration of the nature of the powers of the Faculty, in relation to examinations of this kind, it is not expedient to comply with his request; and thereby admit the reexamination of students in cases of such investigations; the reasons of which may be, more particularly, explained to Whitney's father.

Voted, That Whitney be dissmissed [*sic*] for a term not less than five months, and that he be informed that if any person, in his vicinity, at prayers will confess that he was guilty of the noise on the evening of the 30th of June, his case will be reconsidered.

Whitney and Huger were then both called before the Faculty and their sentences announced to them and both were notified that they must quit Cambridge, immediately and that if by any appearance in the College yard, or continuance in Cambridge excitements should occur, the facts would have an influence on the question of their readmission.

[July 2, 1834, 7 P.M.] A motion was made to reconsider the vote, whereby the reexamination of Wheeler and Thoreau in the case of Whitney had been refused; and it was negatived.

[July 11, 1834.] A letter from Abel Whitney Esq. praying for a rehearing of his son's case was read, and transmitting two letters one written by Wheeler and one by Thoreau Freshmen, stating what they would testify in relation to his son.

Whereupon the statements, made by Wheeler and Thoreau, in their respective statements in said letter were compared with what they had testified previously to the faculty, and with the other evidence, on which the decision of the faculty was originally founded, and all which being considered it was Voted That it is not expedient to make a reexamination of Wheeler and Thoreau, because, admitting that both will testify to the facts stated, in their respective letters, it will not, in the opinion of the faculty, outweigh the evidence, on which the faculty acted; on which vote the Ayes & Nays were [8 to 2.]

---

class "on condition of making up fifty pages in Whately's Rhetoric, one theme, and one translation." He graduated with his class in 1837.

[7] Charles Stearns Wheeler, son of Charles Wheeler of Lincoln, Massachusetts. Like Thoreau, Wheeler had been "offered" for admission by Phineas Allen, the Concord schoolmaster.

Teasing as this is with its omission of the details one would like to hear, we may perhaps conclude that in their interviews with the Faculty, Thoreau and Wheeler were so busy clearing their own names that they failed to mention the facts later to be adduced in defense of Whitney; indeed, they may not then have known that Whitney was particularly under suspicion. There is no indication that the witnesses changed their testimony. It is certain, however, that Thoreau and Wheeler made an effort to clear their classmate by putting their testimony in writing, and by offering—or at least agreeing—to plead his case orally before the Faculty. Here is another glimpse of the friendly Thoreau whom Professor Adams has convincingly pictured.

Yet the same volume offers striking evidence that in this tight little rule-bound community Thoreau was no rebel. The Faculty Records continue with painful detail the procession of delinquencies, but as for Thoreau, the rest is silence; and this is of more significance than all the references together. A total of sixty-three boys were at one time or another members of the Class of 1837. A careful reading of the Faculty minutes for the period from 1833 to 1837 reveals that forty-four (more than two-thirds) of these students were at some time subject to disciplinary action—many of them, of course, on several occasions. Thoreau, soon to be the apostle of civil disobedience, was one of the nineteen who never got into trouble. Even if Henry wore green when black was required, as Marston Watson reported,[8] that misdemeanor never claimed the attention of the Faculty.

To John Weiss, who had been a leader of the Dunkin Rebellion, this willingness to conform may well have indicated a lack of "animal spirits."[9] The evidence does not justify Weiss's portrait, but it helps to explain it. Certainly David Henry must have avoided an active part in the revels of the "young absurdity"; otherwise the Faculty minutes would carry some hint of his misadventures. Had Weiss known Thoreau better, he might have pictured a friendly boy, cordial to his intimates, though never

---

[8] Franklin B. Sanborn, *Recollections of Seventy Years* (Boston, 1909), II, 319.

[9] See quotation from Weiss, and Professor Adams's note in "Thoreau at Harvard," 26.

effusive; amused by the antics of his classmates, but careful not to tear his own homespun on the academic fences.

Did Thoreau consider the rules not worth the breaking? Or was he already supicious of any majority—even a majority of rebels?

BOOK REVIEWS

The editors of the NEW ENGLAND QUARTERLY *neither assume nor accept any responsibility whatever for the opinions of reviewers.*

The Economic Novel in America. By Walter Fuller Taylor. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1942. Pp. ix, 378. $4.00.)

Among the functions of the novelist is that of historian. In the great periods of the English, the Russian, and, above all, of the French novel, this function was so adequately performed that the fiction of these countries provides richer accounts of their respective histories than any professional historian has given. In nineteenth-century America the case was otherwise. While the dramatic events of colonial history, the Revolution, the westward movement; life in the ante-bellum and post-war South; Northern life—rural, urban, and maritime—are richly portrayed in the American novel, it is not until late in the century that a novelist of any great importance turns to another of the vital factors in our history, the rise and triumph of industrialism. There were, to be sure, American novelists of the last century who dealt with the social and economic problems of the Machine Age. Among them were several of our important writers, but their work in this vein, interesting as it is, is hardly a major contribution to literature.

Of the many factors behind what is perhaps the greatest *lacuna* in American literature, this failure of our important novelists to deal adequately with the economic scene, one stands out: there was no clearly achieved tradition in the realistic social novel in America until late in the nineteenth century. Indeed, the abilities of our three greatest writers of fiction before Henry James lay in such an opposite direction that their masterpieces—*The Scarlet Letter, Moby Dick,* and *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*—are hardly novels at all. And James, whose work before 1900 represents the apogee of realism in America, in the end moves away from the realistic social study to the moral fable.

It is significant that *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court,* which Professor Taylor regards as the most important American economic novel in the latter part of the nineteenth century, is not a regular novel but a narrative fantasy.

Whereas in France, for example, Stendhal and Balzac had fashioned the novel into an instrument that Flaubert and Zola could readily use to delineate the effects of a changing society on individuals and groups, and in Russia the way had been thoroughly cleared for the social novelists of the last half of the century, the American novelist who attempted to deal with similar material was handicapped certainly by the absence of a tradition in the realistic social novel. Brockden Brown, Hawthorne in *The House of the Seven Gables* and *The Blithedale Romance,* and Cooper in several novels attempted what with generosity we may call social novels; but it was not this aspect of their work that influenced subsequent American novelists, and no tradition ensued. Thus our first important realistic social novelist, William Dean Howells, found nothing in the American novel upon which to build when he attempted this form, and his chagrin is recorded in his critical writings upon his predecessors. He was of necessity a self-taught realist, whose novels developed from his travel books and his sketches, more or less journalistic, of the life about him. In his maturer novels a certain thinness and a tendency to wander are the result probably of the inadequacy of his training in his craft.

With much of the foregoing analysis Professor Taylor would doubtless disagree. Indeed, of *A Connecticut Yankee, Looking Backward, A Hazard of New Fortunes, Main-Travelled Roads, The Octopus,* and *The Gilded Age* he says, "It would be difficult to find in the problem-fiction of any one generation, anywhere, a half-dozen volumes offering values more fine and abundant than do these." This is a strong statement, and one fears that its author has not overcome one of the dangers that face every biographer and historian, that of becoming an apologist for his subject. As I have indicated, the American novel has great virtues, but it is not pre-eminent in the field of "problem-fiction." When one brings the books that Professor Taylor lists to the tests of the "generations" of Fielding and of Dickens, of Balzac and of Flaubert, of Gogol and of Tolstoy, it will be seen that

no one of them belongs among the great social novels of the world.

It is unfortunate that Professor Taylor should come to such a questionable conclusion as to the value of this group of books, because the body of his study provides us with excellent genetic accounts of the economic fiction of Mark Twain, Edward Bellamy, Hamlin Garland, Howells, and Frank Norris. Here are essays that to a great extent will supplant the work of Parrington and Hicks on the same subjects, although here also Professor Taylor is too ready to reverse the earlier commentators when they speak harshly or slightingly of these figures. Excellent also are introductory chapters on "The Environment" and "The Lesser Novelists," though the conclusion that the "majority of our novelists held a position that may properly be defined as 'Left-Center' " is reached without sufficient recognition of the fact that many novels which are ostensibly reformist, and even "socialistic," betray their true biases as vigorously opposed to organized labor. While the section on the minor writers is extraordinarily complete, one wishes that such archetypal anti-labor novels as C. M. Cornwall's *Free, Yet Forging Their Own Chains* and Robert Grant's *Face to Face,* and such a typical religious approach to the problem as the Reverend Courtland Myers's *Would Christ Belong to a Labor Union?* had been discussed. Also the failure to deal with Dreiser's *Sister Carrie,* although it is in the bibliography, and with Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle,* is, to say the least, puzzling.

The omission of Sinclair and of a number of more recent significant economic novelists is explained by the fact that, despite the title of this study, the author states plainly in the preface his purpose to deal only with the economic novel of the latter nineteenth century. This accounts for the absence of any discussion of the minor but interesting economic fiction dealing with the New England cotton industry before the Civil War and of the early novels on economic themes of Sylvester Judd, Rebecca Harding Davis, and George Lippard. And of the considerable number of economic novels of the twentieth century, many of which are as important as those he has discussed at length, again he has nothing to say, except to refer parenthetically to Hemingway, Caldwell, and Steinbeck in a manner that has become tire-

somely fashionable of late. Their work, Professor Taylor holds, cannot be taken as "serious critical literature" because it fails "to give any adequate treatment of the crucial problem of self-discipline."

The final chapter is regrettably weak, for not only are Professor Taylor's general conclusions about his subject questionable, but also the critical principles he brings to bear on literature are, to this reviewer, suspect. An able exponent of the historical method, he plunges into idealistic obscurantism when faced with the problem of aesthetic analysis. "The intangible factor of creative power mingles tone with tone and makes, not a chord, but a star; adds two and two and makes, not four, but infinity." Here is the clue perhaps to the failure of this book to transcend successfully the level of biography and literary history and to enter the realm of literary criticism. For it is precisely the business of the literary critic to demonstrate how by adding two and two correctly a *Connecticut Yankee* or an *Octopus* is arrived at; not how they equal infinity, but how they are superior to the other American novels of their *genre* (and inferior to *Jonathan Wild, L'éducation sentimentale, Anna Karenina,* and *Germinal*). Art does yield to analysis, even if its problems are more difficult to master than are those of the multiplication table.

GEORGE MAYBERRY.

Harvard University.

Democratic-Republican Societies, 1790–1800. By Eugene Perry Link. Number 9 of the *Columbia Studies in American Culture.* (New York: Columbia University Press. 1942. Pp. xiii, 256. $2.75.)

This scholarly volume makes a significant contribution to our knowledge of the last ten years of the eighteenth century. It was, as Professor Merle Curti says in his Foreword, "a period, like our own, of acute and world-wide crisis," and we are now sufficiently far removed to be able to view it objectively and to sympathize with both the Federalists and the anti-Federalists. We know full well that we should be forever grateful to them both that there

was much of wisdom and of truth in their conflicting interests and resulting theories of government. The peculiar genius of our political heritage lies in the compromise that has been achieved, so that democracy is for us not only the end but the method by which we live together.

For example, the Constitution reflected primarily the interests of the rich, the well-born, and the able—in other words, of the Federalists. But to make it acceptable to the lower classes, the Bill of Rights had to be added, and after the experience of a century and a half, who is there among us who would say that this kind of compromise was not a blessing to our nation? And yet to read the details of the conflict, one would think that these political partisans regarded themselves not as fellow citizens but as enemies who had little if anything in common. Personally, I don't think this problem can properly be described in Marxian terms as a class struggle between the "haves" and the "have-nots." I think rather that we are dealing here with a natural difference in economic—and therefore political—interest, between farmers and merchants, debtors and creditors, and between those who had imbibed the indigenous American tradition of frontier democracy and those who emphasized the European heritage of distinctions of wealth and learning, and the other advantages which accrued to those who had chosen their parents wisely from the upper social stratum.

The democratic-republican societies of 1790–1800 were similar to radical or revolutionary clubs or groups of the time of the American Revolution, but of course in this later period their *raison d'être* was not the same although similarly inspired. They were still strongly anti-British and pro-French, revolutionary and anti-monarchical. The Tories were replaced by Federalists, and the latter were Anglophiles to about the same degree as the former had been two decades previously. The flames and heat of the French Revolution revived the revolutionary ardor in America, and it seemed that in its glow Americans saw their own conflict more clearly than they had in 1776. This seems strange, but I think it is due to the fact that in many ways the American Revolution had not been really revolutionary. That is, in so far as it concerned itself with overthrowing British mercantilism and had American economic and political independence for its goal—

to that extent it was not revolutionary in spirit. Of course I agree with the late Professor J. Franklin Jameson that it had its social implications and was not, and could not be, confined purely to the objectives set by well-to-do merchants of Boston. Its social gains were particularly prominent in the extension of religious toleration, in breaking up estates of Tories, and in more equitable political representation of frontier communities, but Dr. Link's analysis and study of the opinions and point of view of "unimportant" people confirms my own findings that real revolutionary enthusiasm in America was not aroused until the French Revolution lifted the principles of democracy from the realm of the prosaic, the mundane, and even the practical to the heights of philosophic idealism. For example, neither Ethan Allen nor Thomas Jefferson had been anti-monarchical during the American Revolution, and it is significant that in many American communities such names as Liberty Street did not replace royal names, such as King's Highway, until the 1790's. In short, I think we may say that the American Revolution did not have the ideological basis which characterized the French Revolution and that when revolutionary principles crossed the Atlantic after 1789 they illuminated at once both the aspirations and the pressing economic needs of the common man and helped him to see our own revolution as he had never seen it before. In the Fourth of July orations of the 1790's, the revolt of the American Colonies became a movement of universal significance and placed the New World in the vanguard of man's emancipation from despotism and superstition and marked the dawn of a new era for all mankind. It can scarcely be said that the American Revolution had been that in its own time.

The democratic societies were the expression of this movement in America. As Dr. Link's map showing their distribution indicates, they were widespread from the North to the South and from the large cities along the coast to the frontier line (Frontispiece). The lower urban classes and the backwoodsmen not only shared pecuniary problems but had a common aversion to the aristocratic tendencies of the Federalists and the latters' theory of government.

These societies included in their membership, however, many who were not of *hoi polloi*. Among them were merchants "who

saw their bread buttered thickly by trade with France and the French islands in the West Indies" (page 74). Makers of iron implements who suffered from English competition identified their interests with the democrats, as did producers of goods on which excise taxes were levied, especially tobacco and sugar. Intellectuals who gave their allegiance to the democratic cause included physicians, scientists, teachers, lawyers, authors, and printers, who were regarded as belonging to this category. A notable exception, of course, were the clergy, who could scarcely be expected to sympathize with the anti-religious spirit of the French Revolution. Among the few who did was the eloquent deist preacher, Elihu Palmer.

The two most important classes who fostered these societies were printers and innkeepers. The former, of course, disseminated the necessary propaganda in the form of notices, leaflets, pamphlets, and newspapers, without which publicity these groups could not have flourished. Of the innkeepers, Dr. Link says, they "were usually well-informed men, many of them former Revolutionary soldiers who had now assumed a position of respect and leadership in the community. Their profession drew around them travelers from far and wide, who came bearing knowledge of affairs elsewhere" (57). The tavern was the usual meeting place for democratic societies. One needs scarcely to add that these were masculine gatherings. That, in my opinion, is not unrelated to the fact that neither they nor the deistic movement long survived.

These democratic societies disappeared for the most part in 1795 and 1796 (202) but the democratic principles which they fostered were vastly strengthened by them in those most formative first years under our constitution. They made the "unimportant" man a political factor that could not be ignored. His interests were made articulate, and it is the glory of our land that among us the "unimportant" man is not unimportant.

It seems to me that we were peculiarly blessed in our early national development by having two strong groups in conflict on the stage of the 1790's, with the French Revolution as a backdrop. The genius of the Hamiltons and the Madisons, representing the abilities and interests of the upper social strata, produced our constitution and established our government on a

sound basis. The unlettered and the underprivileged could never have done that. But the masses did have a contribution to make. In the words of John Dewey, "The individuals of the submerged mass may not be very wise. But there is one thing they are wiser about than anybody else can be, and that is where the shoe pinches, the troubles they suffer from." And the democratic societies were the organizations which made it possible for the "unimportant" man to make the government responsive to his needs and aspirations. Folks who have no political power are also without political rights; and we do well to learn this lesson from the 1790's that the best interests of the nation are served when no one group controls the state.

We are grateful to Dr. Link for making available this detailed information, gathered mostly from source materials, of one of the most interesting and decisive periods of American history. The democratic process is necessarily one of debate and of reconciling conflicting interests. Its contemporary manifestations, therefore, are often unpleasant and acrimonious—as they were in the period of the French Revolution. But it is an unsurpassed method for men's living together in justice and in liberty, and such studies as these help us to see it objectively, to understand its significance, and to cherish and foster it in our time.

G. Adolf Koch.

Columbia University.

The Andover Liberals: A Study in American Theology. By Daniel Day Williams. (New York: King's Crown Press. 1941. Pp. x, 201. $2.00.)

Andover Theological Seminary was established in 1808 to help stem the tide of liberalism that had been sweeping over eastern New England for a generation. To insure the continued orthodoxy of the faculty of the new seminary, there was placed in its charter a provision that every professor, on the day of his inauguration, should make a declaration of his faith in a creed that had been compiled by the founders, a creed based on the Westminster Confession of Faith, but somewhat modified in its sev-

eral essential features. It was further provided that every five years each professor was to reaffirm his acceptance of the creed. For three quarters of a century, thus fortified, Andover Theological Seminary stood firmly for the old theological views, in spite of the fact of the new theological currents arising about them. The last of the old guard of the New England theology in the Seminary was Edwards A. Park, who since the middle of the century had held the Professorship of Theology. A brilliant teacher and an eloquent preacher, he has been characterized as "an interpreter of the past, not a prophet of the future." With Park's retirement in 1881 almost an entirely new faculty began to be gathered at Andover, with the result that within the next decade a complete theological revolution had taken place in the Seminary. From the standpoint of the development of what came to be known as "the Andover Theology," William Jewett Tucker, Professor of Sacred Rhetoric, and George Harris, Park's successor in the Professorship of Theology, were the most influential. With their coming the "Progressive Orthodoxy," the name given the new Andover theology, began to take shape. The medium for the setting forth of the views of the new faculty was the *Andover Review*, the purpose of which, as announced in the prospectus, was to "advocate the principles and represent the spirit and method of progressive orthodoxy" as well as to show "the obligations of theology to the social and religious life of the time."

It is with this new theology arising at Andover that this book deals. The nine volumes of the *Andover Review* constitute practically the only source, a self-imposed limitation which seems somewhat unwarranted, for there was plenty of reverberation to the Andover theology to be found in other *Reviews* and publications of the time. The author sets his study in a more or less artificial theological framework, which may be one of the reasons why it is difficult to follow. One is reminded of the definition of psychology given by a college freshman as "common sense made hard." In attempting to adjust their theological thinking to the new science, the new history, and the new Biblical scholarship, the Andover leaders followed more or less the motto of the eighteenth-century moderates in the Church of Scotland—they "let sleeping dogmas lie." The author states that they "did not so much contradict as ignore the concepts of orthodoxy." Their

shift of emphasis was basically from "the attainment of the goods of the future life" to "the happiness available in this life." The new orthodoxy accepted the modern criticism of the Bible; it recognized an immanent God at work in the world, and the "evolutionary principle in nature." The most fundamental change, as the author states, was "the incorporation into theology of the idea of development." Also, the new theology was based on "the Love of God rather than on the rigors of the law" and gave greatly increased consideration to human relations.

The appearance of this competent study of one of the important crises in the history of American Christian thought is an indication, let us hope, of a trend in the direction of a larger appreciation of, and an interest in, this phase of American religious and cultural development.

WILLIAM W. SWEET.

University of Chicago.

A Political History of Connecticut during the Civil War. By Brother J. Robert Lane, F.S.C. (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press. 1941. Pp. x, 321. $2.00.)

Following the standard set by Professor Purcell with his *Connecticut in Transition, 1775–1818,* one of his students in The Catholic University of America has produced here another dissertation upon a phase of Connecticut's history. The original plan to deal with the period fom 1850 to 1860 in a single chapter was rightly abandoned as the author found the events of the decade shaping and, in fact, largely determining the political actions of the subsequent five years of war. The first chapter accordingly reveals the straining and cracking of partisan loyalties as first the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 and then the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 hammered the consciences of Democrats, Whigs, and Free Soilers while the Maine Temperance Law was confusing them all. The next chapter shows the further ruin of political alignments caused by the emergence of the Know-Nothing Party from the hostility toward Catholic immigrants which had long since been accumulating. The organization of the Republican Party

from reaction against the opening of Kansas to slavery, however, was but momentarily delayed by this Know-Nothing movement; indeed, as quickly as it appeared it disgusted old Whigs, Free Soilers, and anti-slavery Democrats and hurried them into the newer antislavery crusade.

Chapters Three and Four examine the rise of these Republicans to power and victory at the polls in 1860. But now the Union itself was upon the rack. Could it or could it not be held together by compromising with slavery? What happened elsewhere decided the question as the speech-makers and editorial writers of Connecticut could never do. We see their stumbling in Chapter Five as the war broke them. Chapters Six to Eight relate the distress of these politicians as they answered the call to arms, torn between feelings of varying intensity about slaveholding and a desire for peace that had as much uncertainty. They were dismayed by the drafting of soldiers with its consequent evasions, desertions, and threats of open defiance. They were embittered through it all by their own striving for office and jockeying for public attention.

Chapter Nine closes a story that has become mordant whether or not the author would have it so. At first there was the sullenness of 1864 as old-time Democrats thought they had in General McClellan the man who could replace that civilian in the White House, save much of the old system of "States' rights," and win the peace. But political wishing changed rapidly in Connecticut with events in the Southern States. War Democrats, Republicans, Union men, all rallied to the victor. Lincoln defeated McClellan, though by a narrow margin, nevertheless with the largest vote cast for any candidate in the State up to that time. The year 1865 witnessed an even greater Republican triumph. And there the author ends his study, with a hint of issues to come. The politicians, in the words of a contemporary, turned to the question whether "industrial people of Connecticut" were willing to endorse "a policy that piles the taxes of capital on the back of labor." Whether indeed they were, we probably shall soon see through the eyes of yet another of Professor Purcell's students.

Any one who anticipates from first glance that there will be religious bias in this book will be wholly disappointed. The author has maintained historical detachment even where he

might with justification have expressed sympathy for the newcomers to Connecticut who suffered the indignity of Know-Nothing legislation, only to be courted later when their military service was desired. He has held strictly to his appointed task of discovering the interplay of issues and partisan response, and has let the historical record speak for itself. If fault is to be found with this quality in the dissertation, it is that the author has confined himself too closely to the local record. He has left to the reader rather too much searching for the dynamic forces which created those issues and roused partisan emotions. There could have been more exposition of these forces, and less assumption that the reader would know of them from his familiarity with the national scene. So ready a correlation is hardly to be expected even from the fellow students who will use this dissertation, certainly not from the general readers who may pick it up. And this reviewer would like to have been told a great deal more about the personalities of the outstanding men. They seem drowned in their own words.

ARTHUR B. DARLING.

Phillips Academy.

Timothy Dwight, 1752–1817: A Biography. By Charles E. Cuningham. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1942. Pp. viii, 403. $3.75.)

There has long been a pressing need for a full-length biography of this great President of Yale, and we are fortunate indeed that the first one to appear is such an exceptionally good job. Here is a portrait of the man who, it is rightly noted, has been passed over in a paragraph or two "as an example of perverse and stubborn Puritan reaction" by most recent writers, who apparently did not see that their description failed to account for the great affection and respect with which his contemporaries regarded him, or for the national distinction he achieved, or for the amazingly wide and continued circulation of his written works after his death. With materials for the study admittedly scarce and widely scattered, the author has succeeded in giving us the

"clearer portrait" he attempted, and in showing that Dwight, contrary to a popular notion, was "far from an enemy of progress." If at times he has yielded to the biographer's ever-present temptation to become an apologist, the remarkable thing is that he has yielded so infrequently. Dwight was a man who gave and asked no quarter, and his fellows either liked or disliked him with enthusiasm. Most of those who have written about him since his death have shown the same ardent partisanship.

Timothy Dwight's claim to our attention rests primarily upon his work as one of the most forward looking and capable educators of his day, and upon his work as a theologian and defender of the Christian religion during the dark days following the Revolution when "Infidelity" stalked the land. Mr. Cuningham is eminently successful in presenting his subject in the first of these roles. His treatment of Dwight in the second role probably will not satisfy those who look for a full exposition of the man's thought.

Dwight was gifted with qualities essential to the successful teacher. Foremost was an unbounded and highly contagious enthusiasm for learning that infected those who sat under his instruction. With great initiative he worked out for himself original methods of study, which he applied in teaching others. In a day when pupils were customarily forced along the road to learning with a whip, he was conscious of the danger of breaking the spirit with harsh measures and so defeating the purpose of education. Therefore he developed his "parental" system of discipline, based upon the theory that effective control could be secured by "moral influences." Astounding as it was to many of his contemporaries, the system worked, in the grammar school, in the Academy, and in Yale College, which during Dwight's administration was singularly free from the riotous disturbances that marred the life of sister institutions. Mr. Cuningham might have found eloquent testimony to the success of these principles in the fact that Lyman Beecher and Nathaniel W. Taylor, Dwight's students upon whom fell his mantle of theological leadership, made the idea that God rules his creatures "by motives and not by force" the basic concept of their modified Calvinism, which in turn was the foundation for the religious liberalism of

Horace Bushnell, T. T. Munger, and a host of other "progressive orthodox."

Dwight's career was crowned by his work as President of Yale. In his own words, he came in 1795 to the leadership of "a ruined college." When he died in 1817 it had taken on the first appearances of a modern university. Perhaps his most distinctive contribution to educational administration was the idea of adding young men to the faculty, with the intention that they would devote their entire careers to one field, the outstanding example being the addition of the twenty-two-year-old Benjamin Silliman to teach the new science of chemistry.

As for Dwight's position of religious leadership following the Revolution, it is the opinion of this reviewer that Mr. Cuningham's generally excellent treatment of *The Triumph of Infidelity* (Chapter IX) fails to note the true background of Dwight's thought and under-emphasizes the political aspects of his work.

It has often been said that Dwight was an "Edwardean" in Theology, a follower of his grandfather, the first Edwards, and his uncle, the second. This view has persisted in spite of the fact that his anti-Edwardean tenets were well known. For example, Williston Walker held that Dwight's election to the presidency of Yale College "brought about the ascendency of Edwardeanism in that institution," but on the same page he also noted at least three points where Dwight departed from, or was "earnestly opposed" to that system.[1] Mr. Cuningham also asserts the "Edwardeanism" or "New Divinity" of Dwight, apparently largely on the ground that he must have been the theological as well as the physical son of his mother, Mary Edwards Dwight (101–103). But Cuningham also calls attention to Dwight's considerable softening of the New Divinity, and points out his association with the Old Calvinists of the day (227, 320–321, and 327–328). He does not note that Dwight's true affinity was with the Old Calvinists, and that on the controverted points of Theology he generally took Old Calvinist ground.

The biographer plays down the political aspects of Dwight's "conquest of infidelity" by a failure to emphasize that the "Chris-

[1] *History of the Congregational Churches in the United States* (New York, 1894), 302.

tianity" for which he contended was that of Connecticut's established church, and that its defense unavoidably was bound up with defense of the Federalist party against the encroachments of the Democrats. In this light his argument that "Dwight was not preaching partisan politics for electioneering purposes," in his Fourth of July address in 1798, *The Duty of Americans at the Present Crisis*, is not convincing (397). Nor is his objection that the often quoted "fiery passage" from this oration has been looked upon as "anti-Jeffersonian propaganda" only because it has been considered out of its context. For the sentiments of the passage can be paralleled in several of Dwight's other writings, and also, for example, in Theodore Dwight's famous seventh of July, 1801, oration.

A well rounded bibliography, extensive notes, and complete index add greatly to the readability of this book.

SIDNEY E. MEAD.

University of Chicago.

American Primitive Painting. By Jean Lipman. (London and New York: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. 158, 94 photogravure plates. $5.00.)

Recent years have witnessed a surprising rediscovery of the works of art and decoration which the numerous amateurs, artists, and craftsmen of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, most of them untutored, produced chiefly in the Eastern States, with New England and Pennsylvania as the two centers. We used to cherish these as more or less decorative "antiques" or for their historical connotations, and are only now beginning to see their value as art, as the expression of an inborn artistic feeling and sincere creative urge. The course taken by modern art since the end of the last century, with the new insistence on the more abstract values of pattern and design, and the distrust, if not contempt, of realistic representation, favored a reappraisal of this whole group of oils, watercolors, velvet paintings, samplers, and so forth. A series of noteworthy exhibitions, and a growing number of publications, are the result of this changed approach. The most recent, and one

of the most sumptuous, is Jean Lipman's book *American Primitive Painting.*

Handsomely produced, this large-size volume provides, besides the text, 113 reproductions—eight of them in color—of portraits, landscapes, still-life pictures, and wall decorations. Among them are a good many well-known favorites, and some interesting new "discoveries." A special feature is the good size of most of the reproductions, which makes a detailed study possible.

Here, then, we find again those stiffly drawn faces of stolid men and women of the past, those somewhat embarrassed-looking children with their flowers or toys, charming in skirts and pantalettes—portraits for which the "itinerant limner" prepared, during the long winter, a stock-in-trade bust, the face only to be painted in later after the model. In addition, we have the playful arabesque of the "Sailor" with his cocky stance, the well-arranged "Cellist" of the Phillips Memorial Gallery, or the darkly romantic elegance of "Captain Thomas Baker of Kennebunkport, Me." A fanciful portrait of Oscar Wilde shows a conscious—or unconscious?—attempt at satire, and old Martha Barnes with her pipe also reveals a touch of humor. Otherwise, portraiture was a serious business for these artists whose personalities and even names are still lost in obscurity. They lacked proper technical training, and their sitters obviously were interested only in a dignified appearance. Together, these facts explain why there never appears the ghost of a smile around the lips of these persons, and why the children, too, with the one exception of the lovable "Baby in Red High Chair," look just as serious and self-conscious as their elders.

In a second group, Miss Lipman has brought together landscapes, group pictures, historical and religious scenes, and paintings of the sea and ships. The two Pennsylvanians, Hicks and Pickett, are represented with some of their laboriously constructed animated landscapes. Farm and village scenes give a glimpse of everyday life in summer and winter; quilting and flax-scutching parties provide entertainment; a toy-like train leaves Sacramento, California, to the shouting of four pigtailed Chinamen; and "historical" scenes, painted from memory or hearsay, reflect the American's pride in his nation's heroes. The precious little "Darky-town," from the author's collection, with its totally un-

related figures of dark gentlemen and pickaninnies, may have borrowed its details from silhouettes or prints, just as the famous "Runaway Horse" was undoubtedly adapted from a Currier and Ives print, yet easily succeeds in conjuring up a whole civilization.

A goodly number of young women were kept busy with brush and color, designing, often from cut-out stencils or "theorems," still-life compositions of considerable charm, and mournful memorials for a dear departed, with urn and weeping-willow symbolizing grief and sweet melancholy. Specimens of this work form a third group of reproductions, while the last contains a rather small number of wall-paintings which, according to the statements of Rufus Porter quoted by the author, were based not so much on nature as on beautiful designs which were "easily and quickly produced," and were thought to "excel nature itself in picturesque brilliancy."

Thus the book provides much that is delightful. And yet it leaves one with a feeling of disappointment. Neither in the quality of the prints nor in the comprehensive treatment of the subject can it compare with the outstanding volumes of the same publisher's "Phaidon" series. One would think that here was an opportunity for something like a truly representative survey of the field. But both the selection of material and the brief text—forty-five pages, including bibliography and lists of exhibitions and painters known by name, not eighty pages, as indicated in the prospectus—are too personal to carry conviction, and often tend to confuse rather than to clarify the problem. The very title of the book is debatable. It is all too fashionable today to talk about "primitive" art; and the Museum of Modern Art in New York, the leading proponent in this country of "Primitivism," wisely chose the less spectacular term "American Folk Art" for its exhibition, in 1932, of the "art of the common man of America, 1750-1900." Holger Cahill, in his introduction to the catalogue of this exhibition, made the issue clear enough when he stated that, while much of such work might be called "primitive" in the sense that it is "the simple, unaffected and childlike expression of men and women who had little or no school training in art, and who did not even know that they were producing art," the term "primitive" has associations which make it inappropri-

ate. Cahill explained why "folk art" is the most nearly exact term so far found, since it is "the expression of the common people, made by them and intended for their use and enjoyment. It is not the expression of professional artists made for a cultured class, and it has little to do with the fashionable art of its period."

This definition aptly circumscribes the field, and Miss Lipman fails to put forth convincing arguments for her choice of title. She occasionally uses the term "folk" painters, yet greatly prefers to call them "primitives" since that title allows her to bring her analysis of their style into line with tendencies of modern art. She maintains that "the style of the American Primitive is essentially intellectual and abstract—not quaint, and that it represents the very essence of abstract design, which is the opposite of illusionistic realism." The primitive painter, according to Miss Lipman, approaches painting in an unillusionistic way, painting, for instance, individual localities with "a fine indifference to exact visual appearance."

Such questionable statements have the tendency to make these "folk" painters appear almost as forerunners of modern movements in art, ranking them with such men as the French customhouse official, Henri Rousseau, whose unsophisticated gift for painting has called for so much enthusiasm. They are, moreover, hard to reconcile with the author's repeated observation that these painters formed their style unconsciously, as well as with the historical fact that their declared aim was to give as close an image of reality as they could produce. Several documented anecdotes make this quite clear, or why would painter Francis Alexander consider it highest praise when, after painting some fish, he was assured by an old fisherman that, if they were cut out and laid on the floor with real fish, he could not see the difference.

Indeed, if the untutored American artist had an ideal, it was fidelity to nature. This is so because our civilization in the main is based on realism, and the average person invariably insists on the purest realism because there are only extremely few generally accepted symbols left. Herein lies the fundamental difference between the "folk" artist and the true primitive—if we can agree to mean, by that, a member of an uncivilized race. Both, to be sure, paint or carve a mental image of reality rather than a visual

observation. But the one, steeped in the traditions and beliefs of his tribe, creates a stylized, rigidly patterned symbol which, in its utter simplification, expresses the essence of life and is immediately understood in its significance by the tribe, while the other, owing largely to his technical limitations, rarely succeeds beyond a "frozen" approximation to reality. Folk art thus is almost exclusively still-life art, and though its direct and sincere expression and sometimes clear, vigorous pattern can be very pleasing, one cannot in all fairness compare it with Raphael or the Parthenon sculptures as Miss Lipman, stressing the "abstract" values of the best examples, tries to do.

This is because abstraction in itself does not constitute great art. Richard Bernheimer has recently pointed out that form is only one element, although a significant one, of the total situation presented to the artist, and we have no right to concern ourselves with it to the exclusion of other factors.[1] Moreover, few critics will agree as to what they would call masterpieces of "folk" or "primitive" art. Certainly Miss Lipman's selection contains a number of fine works; others are more of the typical kind, and quite a few, such as "Montgomery Castle" and "Blue House," can be classified only as charming puerilities. The whole problem is made more difficult by the fact that no clear distinction exists, or has been established, between "folk" art and "academic" painting, as implied in the text; not only does Miss Lipman include in her reproductions what might as well be called academic paintings of a rather mediocre kind, but she also lists among "primitive" painters several pupils of Gilbert Stuart, and other artists who acquired a fairly good professional technique. Let us frankly admit that we need a good deal more research and discussion before we can draw definite conclusions, and that the esthetics of "folk" art are still vague. It seems to this reviewer that parallel data from literature ("popular ballads") and music ("folk-songs") deserve further study in this connection.

Thus, to the serious student of American art, Jean Lipman's book is little helpful, and he is further irked by the lack of detailed information about the originals. For the general reader,

1 "In Defense of Representation," a paper read at the Bryn Mawr Symposium on Art, 1940.

it will furnish an introduction to a phase of American art hitherto little appreciated, but deserving to be better known and understood.

WALTER L. NATHAN.

Boston University.

The Maritime Provinces of British North America and the American Revolution. By Wilfred Brenton Kerr. (Sackville, New Brunswick: Busy East Press, Limited. 1942. Pp. 172. $2.25.)

This is the second of Professor Kerr's studies of those British North American colonies which did not participate in the Revolution. The first, dealing with Bermuda, was published in 1936. In the present work Nova Scotia—which then included New Brunswick,—St. John or St. John's Island (now Prince Edward Island), and Newfoundland, are considered.

The story of Nova Scotia during the American Revolutionary period was told brilliantly by Professor J. B. Brebner a few years ago in *The Neutral Yankees of Nova Scotia,* and the study under consideration adds very little to this particular angle. The emphasis, however, is somewhat different. Professor Kerr is concerned chiefly with political and military aspects, though he does not overlook cultural, family, and sentimental ties between the various groups of maritime colonists and Great Britain or with the revolting colonies. Professor Brebner stressed economic and geographic factors and pointed out a curious parallel between the "neutral Yankees" (many of whom had emigrated from New England only a few years before the Revolution) and the earlier neutral Acadians.

The scope of the present volume, dealing as it does with all of the Maritimes, is broader than that of *The Neutral Yankees.* The chief problems of the three colonies at the outbreak of the Revolution are reviewed briefly, and attention is given to the attitude and roles of the various elements in the population, the New Englanders, Scots, Irish, English, Ulstermen, and Acadians. The short accounts of the efforts of Nova Scotia's small group of revolutionary sympathizers to lead their colony into the Revolu-

tion; of the military operations; of the exciting diplomatic duel between the rival Indian superintendents, Allan the rebel and Francklin the loyalist, to win over the local tribes; and of the activities of American privateers along the coasts of Nova Scotia, St. John Island, and Newfoundland make very interesting reading.

Professor Kerr concludes that the lack of any serious grievance against the Imperial government, the positive loyalty of the settlers from England and Scotland to the mother country, and the fact that the New England element in the population was well removed from the influence of such agitators as Samuel Adams were the factors chiefly responsible for the loyalty of the Maritime Provinces.

The volume is well documented; the bibliography is extensive; and there is every indication that the research has been careful and thorough. To those interested in Canadian, colonial, or British Imperial history it should prove of distinct value.

HAROLD A. DAVIS.

University of Maine.

Recollections of an Old Fashioned New Englander. By Frederick W. Dallinger. (New York: Round Table Press, Inc. 1941. Pp. x, 277. $2.00.)

In his seventieth year, Frederick W. Dallinger, Judge of the United States Customs Court since 1932, has here reviewed his strikingly useful and industrious life. The writing must have been a labor of love, to complete a permanent record of achievement in this transitory and rapidly changing world. There are no dramatic incidents to make for heavy sales. Nor are occasions colorfully developed which, with the skilled diction of William Allen White or Lloyd Griscom, might have been made more interesting. The typography of the book is good, the proofreading poor.

To a native of Cambridge, like the reviewer, the early chapters are the most appealing. The story of the well disciplined childhood of a boy of unusual intelligence and of remarkable industry

is pleasantly narrated against a background of simple living and education in the public schools of a city which was then honestly and efficiently governed by the Republican party in Cambridge, which the author later came to command.

In this city of 100,000, the majority of the population already were either foreign born or the children of foreign born; but through the discipline of the supposedly non-partisan caucus of "Temple Hall," not many of the latest arrivals were admitted to paid offices. Councilmen they might become, yes, even Aldermen, but scarcely Superintendent of Streets or Superintendent of the City Water Works, definitely not City Treasurer. Mr. Dallinger's father was City Treasurer after his leather business failed.

Congressman Dallinger's great-grandfather, he tells us, came from Germany and, like many of the immigrants from Germany before our last war, brought elements of value to our Yankee stock. To certain of his principles—hatred of debt, hatred of intemperance, and a profound belief in the reality of a Future Life, the author displayed unqualified allegiance. On some subjects, such as woman suffrage, his opinion changed, but never on these fundamentals. Nor did it matter that the political control in Cambridge rested with the Baptists and Methodists. His father was a pillar of the Episcopal Church, and so was the Congressman. In comparison with the great Universalist and Congregationalist Churches the Episcopalians were not an influential element in Cambridge during the Congressman's youth, and least of all in Cambridgeport, where he was brought up. He taught, however, in the Sunday school of the church of which his father was the treasurer and senior warden and brought up his children to be Episcopalians. His oldest son, who like his father graduated from Harvard with honors, now holds an Episcopalian Parish.

Up to the age of thirty Mr. Dallinger's career was one of unbroken success. Starting from good but comparatively undistinguished beginnings, he had by that time far outdistanced Honorable Arthur P. Rugg and Calvin Coolidge when they were at the same age. As a lawyer he had established a more lucrative practice and argued more cases before the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts. In Congress he did not attract attention proportionate to the reputation he established in the Massachusetts House and Senate, and yet the work that he accomplished in

Washington was valuable. He worked harder than Coolidge, and during his entire political career had a hold on the people of Cambridge which reached into both parties just as President Coolidge's did in Northampton. One suspects that his sense of humor was less than the President's, though it certainly was not entirely lacking, that he talked too much, and that, though perhaps not more egotistical, he permitted his interest and confidence in himself to be more apparent. However, if in life's class he has not achieved the Double First which he did at Harvard, he certainly has achieved a highly creditable career, and his record leads us to suppose that it has been, thanks to a happy marriage and fine children, a repaying one.

ROBERT WALCOTT.

Boston.

George Keith (1638–1716). By Ethyn Williams Kirby. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1942. Published for the American Historical Association. Pp. vii, 177. $3.00.)

No more provocative and challenging figure flashed across the American colonial scene, one is tempted to say, than George Keith; yet he has waited until 1942 for a full-scale biography. Born into the Presbyterian Kirk, influenced by the Cambridge Platonists, converted to Quakerism, of which he became a prolific and mighty propagandist in England and America, founding a schismatic sect (whose members later found congenial spiritual homes among the Baptists and Anglicans), and finally taking orders in the Church of England, making a momentous missionary journey in the colonies for the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and ending his days as rector of a rural parish in England, George Keith touched the religious and intellectual life of the Anglo-American world around the year 1700 at many points. Perhaps the very difficulty of following his devious intellectual peregrinations has frightened previous students away. Dr. Kirby merits praise both for what she attempts and for what she accomplishes.

Keith's opponents took delight in pointing out the inconsis-

tency of his successive positions; the title of an anonymous pamphlet of 1696, *Mr. George Keith at Turners Hall in Philpot-Lane, London, Contradicting Mr. Geo. Keith in the Tolbooth at Aberdeen in 1688...*, suggests how vulnerable he appeared to his contemporaries. Dr. Kirby, after threading her way skillfully through the theological disputes in which Keith was constantly involved, emerges with the conclusion that basically Keith was not so inconsistent as he has seemed. Like his fellow-Scotsman Robert Barclay, Keith brought to Quakerism from his Presbyterian background a rationalistic, somewhat pedantic habit of mind, quite alien to the mystical enthusiasm of George Fox; and his conversion to Quakerism, as Dr. Kirby notes, was "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." This made him an admirable systematizer of an essentially unsystematic religion; what his books contained, however, was not the simple mystical experience of the Inner Light, but something quite different, involving an acceptance of the orthodox Protestant doctrines and a dependence on "outward means and helps" such as the Bible. Consequently, the Quakerism which Keith defended against Cotton Mather in 1688 was far from being as heretical as Mather made it out to be. And the schism which Keith's doctrines caused in the 1690's resulted merely from a belated realization by Friends of the real nature and tendency of his views. Previous students, insufficiently acquainted with Keith's earlier career, have failed to view the incident in this light. Dr. Kirby, however, makes it clear that Keith's position in 1692 was only a frank avowal of what had been latent in his preaching and writing from the beginning, and that from this point it was but a short step and a logical one into the Church of England, with its emphasis on intellectual formulations, "historical" faith, and "outward means." This plausible interpretation of Keith's apparent self-contradictions will perhaps remove some of the reproaches of critics haunted by the hobgoblin of consistency.

Dr. Kirby's book, based on a thorough study of the contemporary pamphlet literature, is a sound and judicious guide to a fascinating career. In two respects, however, it leaves one wishing it were something more. In the first place, the important "separation" of 1690–1695 is treated as if it took place in a vacuum. Keith's part in it is clearly traced, but the other actors are dim,

and the outlines of the struggle are not filled in with the graphic details which might have been gathered from other contemporary sources. And in the second place, the book fails to produce a vivid or memorable impression of the contentious, belligerent, censorious personality Keith was. This would have required a biographer with some of the novelist's gifts. Dr. Kirby has the gifts of the careful historical investigator, and one is grateful for what she has done with them.

FREDERICK B. TOLLES.

Swarthmore College.

Independent Vermont. By Charles Miner Thompson (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1942. Pp. xv, 574. $4.50.)

There is a timeliness about the late Charles Miner Thompson's history of early Vermont that goes far deeper than the timeliness of its appearance at the end of the celebration of the sesquicentennial of Vermont's admission to the Union. For Mr. Thompson shows that it is possible for a historian to be critical, objective, scholarly—to conform, in short, to the professional standards of the guild—and yet to maintain towards his subject an attitude of loyalty, devotion, *pietas*. No sensible person is likely to accuse Mr. Thompson of belonging to the irresponsibles or the debunkers. His love for his native state, his acceptance of the steadying conservative virtues of its people, his good humor, moderation, and fondness for understatement, are not qualities one associates with the devastating intellectuals of the Twenties.

And yet the grandson of the D. P. Thompson who wrote *The Green Mountain Boys* has been obliged to remove the romantic trappings from these eighteenth-century Vermont frontiersmen. And where he has left some trappings—who could describe Ethan Allen without trappings?—they are not precisely romantic. He quotes with approval Wardner's words, "those bands of insurgents, rioters, or outlaws known to history as the Green Mountain Boys," and he sums up Ethan Allen's place in the history of Vermont in a way at once thoroughly Vermont and modern, "In his ability to dramatize himself, to make himself the blazing

embodiment of the cause of Vermont, he was of inestimable value to the state—and to the Onion River Land Company."

Mr. Thompson has written a continuous narrative of the formation of Vermont from its first settlement to its admission to the Union in 1791, a narrative incorporating not only the materials amassed by the earlier historians, but also later and more specialized researches such as those of Matt B. Jones, H. S. Wardner, Lawrence Mayo, Allen French, John Clement, and others. He has sacrificed footnotes and the rest of the *apparatus criticus* to the demands of publishers and—perhaps—general readers, but he contrives almost always to make clear the sources of his materials and the limits between fact and the historian's interpretation of fact. He has a leisurely and good-naturedly ironic style, and in his nearly six hundred pages has ample space to give to the color and detail the mere textbook or *précis* usually fails to provide. He is especially clear and convincing on the land question, in dealing with which he is notably fair to such Yorkers as Colden, Tryon, and Clinton; and his treatment of the organization, methods, and aims of the Allen "interest" or "party," though it would probably have scandalized his grandfather, is an excellent example of our contemporary approach to such matters. Here, as throughout, Mr. Thompson is sceptical without being cynical, realistic without being disillusioned. He is perhaps just a bit too hard on Ira Allen, and comes a little too near hero-worship for Seth Warner; but these are matters of fine shades of opinion, and Mr. Thompson is never the browbeating historian.

A final chapter on "The Vermonters" is a sort of appendix, another attempt to describe the habits of those strange folks who go on voting Republican, filling more than their share of *Who's Who*, farming and manufacturing always on a small scale, paying their debts as they go, distrusting New Dealers and outsiders, even when bearing gifts—above all when bearing gifts—and getting more written about themselves than any group of equal size in the country. Here again, Mr. Thompson is interesting, reasonable, and a good Vermonter. He understands and approves the Vermonter's objection to being "run" by anybody and especially by agents of the federal government. But he is a bit ungenerous. After all, if it is unlikely that ever again the Winooski will flow through the lobby of the Pavilion Hotel in Montpelier, flood

control dams on the Jail Branch and the North Branch built not without benefit of C. C. C. must be given the credit. And the "attractive recreation park" with diamond, grandstand, and swimming pool, which Mr. Thompson admits makes Montpelier a pleasanter spot, owes its existence in part to an agency even less palatable to good Vermonters, the W. P. A.

CRANE BRINTON.

Harvard University.

Sherman Thacher and His School. By LeRoy McKim Makepeace. (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1941. Published for the Thacher School. Pp. xii, 205. $3.00.)

Mr. Makepeace's little book will provide the material for at least an interesting footnote in the yet-to-be-written history of New England's most important export, the preachers and teachers who, in the good old days, carried Yankee culture west of the Hudson. It is the story of how Sherman Day Thacher came out of New Haven to found in California's Ojai Valley the famous boys' school which bears his name.

Thacher came out of the very heart of orthodox New Haven, for he grew up in the house of President Day, and he was the son of a Yale Latin professor of the old school and a great-grandson of Roger Sherman. It is symptomatic of the change that was coming over New England that, despite this background, he merely drifted into teaching. He went west in 1887 without a sense of mission such as impelled so many of his predecessors. The school he founded was a school to prepare the sons of moneyed Easterners for the select Eastern colleges, not an institution for converting the natives. His students were not even required to go to church every Sunday.

The details of the history of Sherman Thacher and his school will interest only old boys or nostalgic schoolmasters. For *Quarterly* readers chief interest will be found in the evidence of the strength of the New England tradition, even in the latter days. Mr. Thacher remained "Mr. Thacher" after forty years in California. The School, despite its concessions to climate—it was per-

haps the first of the "ranch" schools—maintained its emphasis on a rather old-fashioned type of scholarship and character building and looked askance at the pecuniary standards of the Twenties.

One wishes that a greater effort had been made to relate the history of the Thacher School to the larger educational and social history of the period, and to measure the School's influence on the intellectual development and social attitudes of its students. But within the limits the author has set, this is a pleasant, competently written book.

W. J. BENDER.

Phillips Academy.

Lincoln and the Radicals. By T. Harry Williams. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. 1941. Pp. 413. $3.00.)

This well-written volume presents a provocative and challenging thesis. Historians have always recognized that there were in the North, and even within the Republican party, a wide range of views as to the purposes and conduct of the Civil War. But Mr. Williams goes farther. He sees in these years two well-organized and coherent factions struggling for control of the war effort: the "radicals" under a group of "bosses" who generally dominated Congress, and the "conservatives" under the President.

Yet though he feels that the two groups were distinct and hostile, Mr. Williams nowhere puts down specifically what the differences between them were. The points of division are only hinted at. At first, it is implied, the "conservatives" would have limited the objectives of the war to restoration of the Union, while the "radicals" wanted a war for abolition. When that difference disappears in 1863 the distinction seems vaguely based on attitudes towards reconstruction and revenge against the South.

That Mr. Williams has trouble delineating the two parties is not surprising. Individuals differed on various questions, and shifting coalitions formed on one issue after another; but no line of division was permanent. The discussion of the Wade-Davis manoeuvers (325–327), for instance, illustrates the impossibility of fixing the critical personalities in one camp or another. Con-

sequently, the author's effort to assign party labels to the characters of his story leads to numerous contradictions. On page 15 the Blairs are conservative Democrats; on pages 24 and 38 they consort with "Jacobins"; but soon thereafter are "conservative" again. On page 27 the "Jacobins" are attacking Cameron; on page 28 Chase is "the Jacobins' representative in the Cabinet"; but on page 29 Chase is "connected with the secretary of war in many of the plans and organizations going forward." In fact, in at least one place, three parties—the "conservatives," the "Jacobins," and the "abolitionists"—are distinguished (6).

Zeal for a thesis has throughout fathered bad logic and serious, if unconscious, distortions. Thus the presidential pretensions of Frémont, Rosecrans, Chase, and Butler in 1864 are interpreted (Chapter XII) not as the expressions—on the whole unimportant—of individual ambition, but as a devious plot to unseat the President, though on page 311 the "Jacobin bosses" were curiously aware that any attempt to replace Lincoln would be unsuccessful and would "embarrass the unity of the friends of the Union." To demonstrate the quality of Mr. Williams's use of materials, one need only supply the italics in the following:

> *It was not the function of Congress,* insisted Lincoln's supporters, *to define the purposes of the war.* Senator Collamer, veteran Vermont Republican, summed up their views in an interview at Boston on his way to Washington: "War is not a business Congress can engineer. It is properly executive business, and *the moment Congress passes beyond the line of* providing for the wants of the government, and *deciding the purposes of the war,* to say how it shall be conducted, the whole thing will prove a failure" (54).

Similarly the quotations from Senator Sherman on page 8, and from Sumner on page 13, do not seem to this reviewer to substantiate the statements they support. And it is difficult to see how the attack on Cameron was "the first step in a program to bring the executive branch under congressional supervision" (27).

Some of this involved treatment may be traced to a persistent animus against the diverse individuals whom Mr. Williams labels "radicals." On page 5 we learn that, out of his "superficial reading" on the French Revolution, John Hay dubbed some of Lincoln's opponents "Jacobins." Nevertheless that epithet appears

on almost every page and reflects the deep prejudice of the author, particularly when the unfortunate "radicals" to whom it is applied are contrasted with the "reasonable, able men" who earn the title "conservative." But such prejudice is hardly surprising in a treatment which asserts, on page 37, that "the Jacobins would have winked at Cameron's peculation if he had been right on the slavery question," and yet notes three pages later that Cameron *was* currying "Jacobin" favor on that very issue. Mr. Williams also knows how to dispose of those he dislikes with pointed, if not always accurate, adjectives. "Aristocratic Charles Francis Adams," "impetuous George W. Julian," "pompous Salmon P. Chase," and "canny Simon Cameron" get by lightly. But a severer treatment is accorded to Sumner, a "show-window display"; Phillips, a "product of Calvinism in politics"; and "the always irritable William Pitt Fessenden, . . . a cross between a statesman and a shrew."

The misinterpretation of Lincoln's character is as violent as that of the "radicals." To label Lincoln the member of any party is to misread the quality of his greatness. For his pre-eminence as a statesman derived from his superlative opportunism—from the ability to meet each situation as it arose without prejudice of party, or even of principle.

OSCAR HANDLIN.

Harvard University.

The Politics of Mercantilism. By Philip W. Buck. (New York: Henry Holt & Company. 1942. Pp. viii, 240. $2.00.)

The Politics of Mercantilism, by Philip W. Buck, is a little book that sets out to do two big jobs. Primarily it presents a straight history of the economic and political ideas of English mercantilist writers of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries. Secondarily, by means of a very brief introduction and final chapter, it sketches the striking similarities between the militant nationalism of the mercantilist system of society and that of the modern totalitarian states. Both of these jobs were worth doing. Mr. Buck brings to them considerable knowledge and

ability. The result is an informative and stimulating book. But in all probability it would have been much more effective had it been devoted to a single purpose—had it been either a history or a political essay.

The principal chapters are clearly historical writing. Especially valuable is the collection from scattered sources of the basic political assumptions of writers who were either business men or economic theorists. The research material is unimpeachable and the evidence convincing. The divisions of chapters and sub-sections make for perfect, even occasionally laborious, lucidity; never is a transition cloudy or a recapitulation missing.

But the power of the book as history is weakened by the attempt to make it a plausible prologue to a political essay. Many references are reserved for a lengthy section of "Bibliographical Notes" at the end of the volume, and there treated most summarily. The bare bones of structure are painfully evident at times because of the effort to shunt as much historical evidence as possible into the appendix. The result may be streamlined narrative, to please the reader mainly interested in the political comparisons to follow; but as history it is close to an outline, with good illustrations from written materials. For example, the place of New England in the English mercantilist system is described in one sentence, supported by two quotations. The quality of these observations makes the reader wish for a more thorough, scholarly piece of history.

At the same time, the rather brilliant little essay pointing out the basic features in common between the politico-economic ideas of mercantilist and totalitarian nationalisms is deadened by the relatively overlong historical discussion. As a fifty-page critique of totalitarianism by comparison with its early English counterpart, the book would have been extremely enlightening and entertaining. As a real history of mercantilist political concepts, it could have been a solid contribution to learning. But Mr. Buck has attempted to write a double-barrelled book. He has hit the target with both barrels; with either one alone he might have hit the bull's-eye.

RAY S. CLINE.

Harvard University.

Letters by T. W. Parsons. Edited by Zoltán Haraszti. With an essay by Austin Warren. (Boston: The Trustees of the Public Library. [n.d.] Pp. 126. Paper covers, $.50, board covers, $1.00.)

Some 180 letters by Parsons are printed in this brochure, a few in full but the majority in brief excerpts. Mr. Haraszti supplies a biographical background for the letters and faithfully identifies the forgotten New Englanders who appear therein. More significant are Parsons's references to his great contemporaries in Massachusetts. Longfellow, whom he superficially resembles at several points, has his complete reverence. (Parsons could never forget, in his association with Brahmins, that he was a dentist and no Harvard man.) Of the youthful Lowell he did not entirely approve: "His new work ... bids fair to be popular. I mean the *Bigelow Letters* [*sic*]; another thing of his, *A Fable for the Critics* [*sic*], is not so fortunate." But Lowell later befriended him and became another object of his devotion—particularly when the great man demonstrated that he could pun almost as abominably as the humble Parsons: "Your note would have given me unqualified pleasure, but for the 'Mr.' with which it began. In future let there be no *misteries* between us." He honored Emerson likewise; but after the master was dead, Parsons criticized his Transcendental faith:

> A certain space our Master went astray
> From the known path to wander with the rest
> Of those who, dazzled by some sun-dog's ray,
> Sincerely fancying they beheld the day
> Dawn against nature's order in the West,
> Could couple Christ with Gautama and bound
> The Rock of Ages with a dial's round.

Like his contemporaries, Parsons underrated Thoreau. When the latter's defense of civil disobedience appeared in Elizabeth Peabody's *Aesthetic Papers* together with contributions from Emerson and Hawthorne, he remarked: "I think that Mr. Thoreau has got into better company than he deserves and doubt if there is much in him." Whitman was likewise beyond the pale; and Parsons, traveling abroad, was sadly disconcerted when highly cultivated Englishmen asked, "What is Whitman doing now?" and

"I suppose Walt Whitman you consider your greatest poetical genius, don't you?"

For Parsons, Mr. Warren has intelligent sympathy, as a minor writer representative at once of his own and an earlier age; as an exemplification of the laws, not of success, but of failure; as an "incompletely realized" poet who occasionally strikes off a precious line; and as an Anglo-Catholic. But Mr. Warren, in summarizing the events of the poet's life and in evaluating his poetry, wisely avoids any suggestion that posterity has done Parsons less than justice in forgetting him. He enumerates, instead, the reasons for Parsons's failure to fulfill his early promise: his "lifelong detachment from the active concerns of Americans," his inability to define the "classical" poetry which he would write or to "apprehend its idiom or aim," his "obsession with a Europe in which he could not live," his captivation with "a past which he could reconstruct according to his own fancy," and his absolute surrender to Dante, whose "colossal shadow" did much to keep his own slender genius from flowering.

TREMAINE MCDOWELL.

University of Minnesota.

The Dana Saga: Three Centuries of the Dana Family in Cambridge. By H. W. L. Dana. (Cambridge: The Cambridge Historical Society. 1941. Pp. 61. $1.00.)

This account of nine generations of one family, resident for three centuries in one place, is a fascinating and valuable history deserving an audience wider than one composed of genealogical students. Mr. Dana's monograph, written with an ease that is refreshingly in contrast to the usual family history, traces the Danas back to 1571 and then gets down to the serious yet engaging work of telling the history of the Cambridge family.

The first Richard Dana came to Cambridge in 1640, and with the passage of time his descendants became identified with this place somewhat as the Adams and Quincy families were with the village of Braintree. Like the Adamses, too, there was a striking family resemblance in the Dana mind. There was, furthermore, a peculiarly unfortunate consistency in their failure to fulfill

their high potentialities. As Mr. H. W. L. Dana points out, there are to be found in the Cambridge Danas many instances of "high ambitions disappointed," but he is also right in saying that theirs is the story of a series of men "seeking to bring about order and justice and intelligence in a world filled with confusion and inequality and ignorance—a series of men baffled and disappointed in their highest ambitions, but bravely keeping their courage."

Among these men are the second Richard Dana, a "Son of Liberty" whom John Adams described as "One who, had he not been cut off by death, would have furnished one of the immortal names of the Revolution"; Francis Dana, member of the Continental Congress, champion of Washington, and Minister to reactionary Russia seeking aid for revolutionary America; Richard Henry Dana, a precursor of the Romantic Movement in American literature; Richard Henry Dana, Jr., humanitarian writer and lawyer, the author of *Two Years Before the Mast*, one of the truly great accounts of life at sea; and Richard Henry Dana, 3rd, who devoted his long life to fundamental democratic reforms.

This is an important and interesting American family and Mr. H. W. L. Dana has done a valuable piece of work in preserving its history in such a charming and careful manner.

JAMES D. HART.

Somerset, Maryland.

The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas. By Carl Becker. Reprinted with an introduction by the author. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 1942. Pp. xvii, 286. $3.00.)

The Maritime History of Massachusetts, 1783–1860. By Samuel Eliot Morison. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1941. Pp. xi, 420. $4.00.)

For those who can remember the first appearance, twenty and twenty-one years ago, of Professor Becker's *The Declaration of Independence* and of Professor Morison's *The Maritime History of Massachusetts*, to learn now that both books have long been out of print but still are held in such high esteem by their publishers (*The Declaration* by a publisher other than the original)

that they can come forth once more into the market is, for one thing, to realize how quickly the time has passed. For another, the triumphant reappearance of the volumes is a demonstration, both to such readers and to readers still younger, of the immensely superior vitality, as against scholarship which is merely competent and thorough, of such pieces of research as manage at the same time to become works of art Professor Becker supplies for this edition an introduction which, with his usual felicity of wit, recounts the origins of his now "classic" volume, and defends it against certain criticisms that have rankled in his sensitive bosom. Interestingly enough, it is no attack upon his researches or his interpretation that can disturb him: he is to be made uncomfortable only by a slur upon his artistry, by the charge that he has violated a canon of literary faith. Hence he takes this occasion to resurrect a now forgotten notice by Mr. James Truslow Adams and to reply, two decades later, to Mr. Adams's charge that his lengthy chapter on the drafting of the Declaration is not strictly relevant to his main theme. He does defend himself, and at length, but to expect of Professor Becker that he should reply merely in the forthright manner of a man outraged is to forget his vast capacity for self-deprecation and for irony; though he pleads everything he can think of, the rigors of his literary conscience at last compel him to confess that this particular section is indeed much too detailed and elaborate, and he sends the book out the second time with a recommendation that the reader judiciously skip these fifty-nine pages. The reader, exhilarated over the spectacle of a historian so deeply concerned with the problem of form, can afford to dispense with the pages, for there remain a hundred or more on the philosophy of natural rights and on the theory of the British Empire, to stand as models to despairing imitators of how history should be told.

Professor Morison contributes no new preface and presumably does not feel that any of his chapters need defense or skipping. The book still opens with the coast and sea, and still ends with the same breath-taking flourish, as no historical enterprise had ever before dared to end—with a bar of a sailors' chantey. In between, the writing is as fine as it ever was.

PERRY MILLER.

Harvard University.

SHORT NOTICES

The Republic of the United States. By Jeannette P. Nichols and Roy F. Nichols. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1942. 2 volumes. Pp. 638. $3.50.)

This is an expansion of the authors' one-volume college text in American history (*The Growth of American Democracy,* New York, 1939) into a two-volume work designed for use in year courses. In line with current trends, the first volume carries the story through 1865; the second treats the years from the Civil War to the present. Most of the expansion has taken place in the first volume, which devotes 575 pages to a period covered in 272 pages in the one-volume edition. Thus the treatment of the Colonial period has grown from sixty-three to 172 pages, the Revolutionary period is now covered in 197 pages rather than seventy-seven, and the years from 1819 to 1865 require 212 pages rather than 127. This expansion has been accomplished partly by a fuller treatment of matters previously discussed, and partly by the addition of a number of excellent new chapters. The greater space not only makes possible a better-rounded picture of American development, but allows the authors to employ several illustrations and maps not found in the one-volume edition. The work is characterized by the same clear writing and sound interpretation which has accounted for the wide use of the one-volume text.

RAY ALLEN BILLINGTON.

Smith College.

Death at the Purple Rim. By Hyam Plutzik. (New York: Privately printed. 1941. Pp. 37. $1.50.)

The deliberate melodrama of the title strikes the note of restrained irony, partly humorous, more melancholy, which is maintained throughout what is thematically a small-scale *Paradise Lost.* The erstwhile Garden of Eden was "a little valley . . . In Connecticut's northern hills," a farm to which the narrator had

escaped from "the great Gehenna" of the city, as his father from "the pitiless Russian plain." But "Five years have passed since I laughed at work in the garden." "Angels are figments and burning swords are but fables"—the shadow over the aforetime paradise is the memory of a groundhog (*"O drinker of sunlight!"*), which with a rifle bullet he had made to "drink deep of darkness." The whole inescapable unsolvable problem of a life which maintains itself by destroying the life of animals, including men, be it suddenly or slowly, passes through the mind of the present-day Adam, who has eaten too rapidly and too fully of the Fruit of the Tree of Bitter Knowledge, as he stands over his mortally-wounded quarry, and is conveyed to the reader in a sinewy, flexible blank verse and in an idiom sensitive and moving without being maudlin.

It is to be hoped, however, that the writing and publication of this poem will suffice to lay the Ghost of the Garden; five years is too long for brooding over a needlessly-slaughtered woodchuck, though anyone not a "natural killer" will sympathize with the author's feelings. The typography is excellent, which is more than can be said for the flimsy stiff-paper binding; I should welcome the author in an appearance more public and in a worthier physical medium.

KENNETH PORTER.

Vassar College.

Religion and the State: The Making and Testing of an American Tradition. By Evarts B. Greene. Anson G. Phelps Lectureship in American History. (New York: New York University Press. 1941. Pp. viii, 172. $2.75.)

This volume of lectures is a welcome addition to the meager list of scholarly books on American ecclesiastical history. It gives a comprehensive account of the gradual separation of church and state in America, bringing together much information that students have hitherto had to search for in a variety of sources. Each lecture is well documented, and a bibliography suggests books for further study in every phase of the subject. Teachers of American history should find the volume especially useful.

The lectures are confined chiefly to institutional history. Professor Greene has not seen fit to discuss in any detail the changes in theology and political theory which accompanied each new development in church-state relations. Though limitations of space doubtless imposed this restriction, the value of the book might have been enhanced if more consideration of relevant religious and political ideas could have been included, for the difference in relations between church and state in the seventeenth century and in the nineteenth must be attributed in large measure to differences in theological and political beliefs. Though Professor Greene has suggested enough of the intellectual background to give significance to the events he describes, one nevertheless wishes that having dealt so comprehensively with the events themselves, he will now go on in another book to discuss with equal thoroughness the issues involved in the events.

EDMUND S. MORGAN.

Harvard University.

Uncle Sam's Stepchildren: The Reformation of United States Indian Policy, 1865–1887. By Loring Benson Priest. (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1942. Pp. 310. $3.75.)

Mr. Priest sets out to correct what he believes is an erroneous, albeit the official, conception of the Dawes Severalty Act of 1887 as merely "the latest and most contemptible feature of America's long abuse of the Indian race." It is not his purpose to extol the Dawes Act by criticizing the present Indian policy, but rather to describe the background of the Act so that its meaning in 1887 is clear. Approaching the matter in this way, Mr. Priest finds the Act to have been a compromise of selfishness and idealism constituting the first attempt in the history of the American republic to reach a permanent solution to the Indian problem.

In this light, the author of the Act, Henry Laurens Dawes of Massachusetts, Chairman of the Indian Committee of the Senate, appears as something very like a true statesman. Though his mistakes are not glossed over, full justice is done to the sincerity of his friendship for the Indians and of his desire to protect them, to his understanding of the complexities of Indian administration,

and to his sense of the political exigencies of reform. In short, Mr. Priest rehabilitates the reputation of an almost great New Englander. Other reformers from this section, such as Helen Hunt Jackson, figure only incidentally in the book.

RICHARD STORR.

Cambridge.

Introduction to the English Language. By Albert H. Marckwardt. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1942. Pp. xiii, 349. $2.15.)

Professor Marckwardt's book is based upon the idea maintained by Professor Robert L. Ramsey, of Missouri, that the college study of the English language can begin as well from Modern English working backward as from the Anglo-Saxon and Middle English periods working down to the present; and the success of his treatment goes far toward establishing that point of view. Beginning with two long sections on the sounds and grammar of Modern English and a shorter one on the vocabulary, including its various non-Anglo-Saxon sources, he closes with brief historical sections dealing with Early Modern (Elizabethan), Middle, and Old English. A useful feature is the large amount of well-thought-out exercises for students.

A good and intelligent explanation is given (63–65) of the glide or linking *r* which New England country speech retains before a vowel at the beginning of a new word (our aunt); tends to insert when a word ending in a vowel is followed by one beginning with a vowel (Emmar Allen); and more rarely fixes at the end of a word like *idea* which frequently stands in a pre-vocalic position (the idear of getting up early).

M. E.

NOTES CONCERNING THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AT WASHINGTON

The *Seventh Annual Report of the Archivist of the United States* (95 pages), recently published, describes the work of The National Archives during the fiscal year 1940–41, including its contributions to the national defense program, its assistance in the various fields of scholarly research, and its services to the general public.

Over a hundred accessions of records were made by The National Archives during the quarter ending March 31, 1942, according to *National Archives Accessions* No. 9, the latest quarterly supplement to the *Guide to the Material in The National Archives.* The volume of material covered is the largest ever to be accessioned in a single quarter, and the extreme diversity of research materials included is illustrated in the chronological scope of the material, ranging from original population schedules for the census of 1790, on the one hand, to the records of the Division of Agriculture of the recent National Defense Advisory Commission (a predecessor of the War Production Board), 1939–41, on the other hand. Material on the first World War, which continues to be particularly useful for wartime research, includes War Department records of the Judge Advocate General and of the Inspector General pertaining to the American Expeditionary Forces; Commerce Department files on salvage, merchant marine recruitment, and industrial cooperation; records of the Capital Issues Committee; records of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; and records of various post-war claims boards of the War and Navy Departments.

In response to the research needs of certain war agencies, two analytical lists of material in The National Archives were recently completed, entitled *List of Climatological Records in The National Archives* (lxii, 160 pages) and *Materials in the National Recovery Administration Files of Interest to the Office of Production Management and Other Defense Agencies* (162 pages), the latter issued in cooperation with the former OPM. The first five numbers in a new series of *Reference Information Circulars,* which describe materials in The National Archives relating to the Philippine Islands (6 pages), the Southern and Western

Pacific areas (14 pages), France, Belgium, and the Netherlands (12 pages), the Balkan states (4 pages), and the Scandinavian countries (5 pages), have been issued primarily for the guidance of wartime officials engaged in research. Other recent processed documents available include *Historical Units of Agencies of the First World War,* by Elizabeth B. Drewry (19 pages), and a *Select List of Publications and Processed Documents of The National Archives* (2 pages).

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Dr. Vladimir Astrov, author of several works in Russian and German on the history of Russian literature, came to the United States in 1940.

Hamilton V. Bail, a certified public accountant in New York, has written a number of articles on Harvard history.

Reverend William L. Lucey, S.J., is a member of the Department of History at the College of the Holy Cross.

Frederick T. McGill is assistant professor of English in the University of Newark.

George W. Pierson is associate professor of history in Yale University.

Bertha-Monica Stearns is professor of English Literature at Wellesley College.

J. B. Wilson is a member of the faculty of the Arkansas State Teachers' College, at Conway, Arkansas.

DONORS

TO

THE NEW ENGLAND QUARTERLY

THE COLONIAL SOCIETY OF MASSACHUSETTS

AND

ELIZABETH LASELL

AUGUSTUS P. LORING, JR.

STEPHEN WILLARD PHILLIPS